

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered. The resolution, as amended, was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to conduct a thorough study and investigation with respect to the following matters:

(1) Postal rates and charges in relation to the reasonable cost of handling the several classes of mail matter and special services, with due allowances in each class for the care required, the degree of preferment, priority in handling, and economic value of the services rendered and the public interest served thereby.

(2) The extent to which expenditures now charged to the Post Office Department for the following items should be excluded in considering costs for the several classes of mail matter and special services:

(A) Expenditures for free postal services;
(B) Expenditures in excess of revenues for international postal services;

(C) Expenditures for subsidies for postal services pursuant to law or legislative policy of Congress;

(D) Expenditures in excess of revenues, pursuant to the act of June 5, 1930 (39 U. S. C. 793), not enumerated in the preceding subparagraphs (A), (B), or (C);

(E) Expenditures for services of any character not otherwise enumerated herein which may be performed for other departments and agencies of the Government; and

(F) Expenditures which may be justified only on a national welfare basis and not primarily as a business function.

(3) Expenditures for the Post Office Department by other Government agencies which should be considered in connection with the cost for the handling of the several classes of mail matter and special services, such as employees' retirement, use of Government buildings, and maintenance services.

(4) The extent, if any, to which Post Office Department expenditures in excess of revenue, for its various services and for the handling of various classes of mail, are justified as being in the public interest.

(5) The costs of handling, transporting, and distributing the several classes of mail, and procedures whereby such costs can be reduced through improvements in methods and equipment.

(6) Other matters relating to the improvement of the postal system.

The committee shall report to the Senate not later than January 31, 1954, the results of its study and investigation under this resolution, together with such recommendations as it may deem advisable.

SEC. 2. (a) For the purpose of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to employ upon a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants as it deems advisable, and, with the consent of the head of the department or agency concerned, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government of the United States.

(b) The committee is authorized to appoint an advisory council of not more than 10 persons which may include representatives of the general public, representative users of the mails, members of accounting, management, and engineering firms, postal experts, representatives of postal employee organizations, and, with special reference to ratemaking in their fields, representatives of public transportation and distribution organizations. The functions of the council shall be to assist the committee in the studies and investigations authorized by this resolution. The council shall meet at such

times and places as may be authorized by the committee.

(c) The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed \$100,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I move that the Senate adjourn until Monday next at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 7 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, March 9, 1953, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 6, 1953:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Robert D. Murphy, of Wisconsin, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, now Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Japan, to be an Assistant Secretary of State.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

John M. Allison, of Nebraska, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Japan.

UNITED NATIONS

Mrs. Lorena B. Hahn, of Nebraska, to be the representative of the United States of America on the Commission on the Status of Women of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations for a term expiring December 31, 1955.

COUNCIL OF ECONOMIC ADVISERS

Arthur F. Burns, of New York, to be a member of the Council of Economic Advisers.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 6, 1953:

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Harry N. Routzohn, of Ohio, to be Solicitor for the Department of Labor.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA REDEVELOPMENT LAND AGENCY

Richard R. Atkinson to be a member of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency, for a term of 5 years, effective on and after March 4, 1953.

IN THE ARMY

The following-named officers for temporary appointment in the Army of the United States to the grades indicated under the provisions of subsection 515 (c) of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947:

To be brigadier generals

Col. Claude Monroe McQuarrie, O12830.
Col. William Lenoir Wilson, O16950, Medical Corps.

Col. Emil Lenzner, O15810.
Col. William Joseph Bradley, O15967.
Col. Ralph Morris Osborne, O16399.
Col. Wallace Hayden Barnes, O16426.
Col. George Edward Martin, O16802.
Col. Philip DeWitt Ginder, O16904.
Col. Louis Theilmann Heath, O18060.
Col. Edwin Rudolph Petzing, O8463.
Col. Charles Harold Royce, O15769.
Col. Paul Maurice Seleen, O16139.
Col. Ralph Copeland Cooper, O17741.
Col. Eugene Fodrea Cardwell, O38662.
Col. Egbert Wesley Van Delden Cowan, O11744, Dental Corps.
Col. Willis Richardson Slaughter, O5296.
Col. William Lawrence Kay, O10349.
Col. Harrison Shaler, O12080.
Col. John Battle Horton, O15150.

Col. Stanhope Brasfield Mason, O17295.
Col. Robert William Porter, Jr., O18048.
Col. Derrick McCollough Daniel, O29500.
Col. George Andrew Rehm, O12772.
Col. Louis Holmes Ginn, Jr., O17341.
Col. James Stewart Willis, O15607.
Col. Holger Nelson Toftoy, O16422.
Col. Frank Coffin Holbrook, O16654.
Col. Max Sherred Johnson, O16745.
Col. Robert Highman Booth, O18093.
Col. William White Dick, Jr., O18384.
Col. Earle Gilmore Wheeler, O18715.
Col. William Childs Westmoreland, O20223.
Col. Louis Watkins Prentiss, O14672.
Col. Francis Elliot Howard, O16776.
Col. George Edward Lynch, O17715.
Col. Theodore William Parker, O18369.
Col. Charles Edward Hoy, O18556.

NOTE.—Above-named officers were appointed during the recess of the Senate.

IN THE NAVY

Eleanor M. Hahn to be a lieutenant in the Nurse Corps in the Navy.

WITHDRAWALS

Executive nominations withdrawn from the Senate March 6, 1953:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Walter J. Cummings, Jr., of Illinois, to be Solicitor General of the United States.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

William J. Bray, of Connecticut, to be Assistant Postmaster General.

SENATE

MONDAY, MARCH 9, 1953

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O God, from whom all noble desires and all good counsels do proceed, rise mercifully with the morning upon our darkened hearts. In this tragic and tangled world we are conscious of our woeful inadequacy to sit in the seats of judgment, to balance the scales of justice and to respond with equity to the myriad calls of human need. In this forum of a people's hope wilt Thou crown the deliberations with spacious thinking and with sympathy for all mankind, multitudes of whom are bound by the shackles of tyranny. Facing questions which confront us and almost confound us, quicken in us, we beseech Thee, every noble impulse and dedicate to Thy glory and for human good our best endeavors; transform every task into a throne of service, and sanctify this new week of labor in the ministry of public affairs with the benediction of Thy approval. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. TAFT, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, March 6, 1953, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE— ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 2230) to amend the act of June 23, 1949, as amended, to remove the monthly limitations on official long-distance telephone calls and official telegrams of Members of the House of Representatives without affecting the annual limitation on such telephone calls and telegrams, and it was signed by the Vice President.

BOARD OF REGENTS OF SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair appoints the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] as a member of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, in lieu of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], who has tendered his resignation as a member of the Board.

MEMBER OF COMMITTEE INVESTIGATING EFFECTIVENESS OF FOREIGN INFORMATION PROGRAMS

The VICE PRESIDENT. Pursuant to Senate Resolution 44, extending the authority for the investigation with respect to the effectiveness of foreign information programs, the Chair appoints the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] as a member of that committee.

MEMBER OF FEDERAL RECORDS COUNCIL

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair appoints J. Mark Trice, Secretary of the Senate, as a member of the Federal Records Council, vice Leslie L. Biffle.

CORRECTION OF COMMITTEE HEARING TRANSCRIPT

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a correction be made about two-thirds of the way down page 40 of the hearings of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency. Where the transcript of the hearings indicates that the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] made a certain statement, the name of the speaker should have been printed as "Senator PAYNE."

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the correction will be made.

Mr. CAPEHART. I have received a letter from the American Council on Human Rights which I should like to read, because that organization likewise desires that a correction be made. The letter reads as follows:

AMERICAN COUNCIL ON HUMAN RIGHTS,
Washington, D. C., March 6, 1953.

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART,
Chairman, Committee on Banking and
Currency, Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAPEHART: The printed record of the hearings on the nomination of Albert B. Cole contains an error which I herewith call to your attention.

On page 34 at the beginning of my testimony the record states, "We are not here

approving him, * * *." I really said, "We are not here opposing him, * * *."

Will you kindly file this letter with the official record in the event any question arises?

Thank you.

Sincerely yours,

ELMER W. HENDERSON, Director.

Mr. CAPEHART. I ask unanimous consent that the letter may be printed in the body of the RECORD, and the correction made in the report of the hearings.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the correction will be made.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON CONSTRUCTION OF POTENTIAL BRAZIL DAM AND RESERVOIR, NEBR.

A letter from the Under Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Department of the Interior on a plan for the construction of the potential Brazil Dam and Reservoir, Nebr.—supplemental works for the Fort Laramie division, North Platte project, Wyoming-Nebraska (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

ADMISSION OF DISPLACED PERSONS— WITHDRAWAL OF NAME

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, withdrawing the name of Chien-Yuan Chen from a report transmitted to the Senate on January 15, 1952, pursuant to section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended, with a view to the adjustment of her immigration status (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF WASHINGTON

A letter from the Vice Chairman, Export-Import Bank of Washington, transmitting, pursuant to law, the 15th semiannual report of that bank for the period July-December 1952 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS OF COMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1934

A letter from the Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, transmitting proposed amendments to the Federal Communications Act of 1934, as amended (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

LIFESAVER APPLIANCES FOR CERTAIN MERCHANT VESSELS

A letter from the Commandant, United States Coast Guard, transmitting, pursuant to law, two copies of part II of the daily issue of the Federal Register dated October 18, 1952, relating to the revision of the rules and regulations governing lifesaving appliances for merchant vessels operating on the oceans, Great Lakes, and bays, sounds, and lakes other than the Great Lakes, as well as for foreign vessels carrying passengers from the United States (with accompanying documents); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT ON BORROWING AUTHORITY

A letter from the Acting Director, Executive Office of the President, Office of Defense Mobilization, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on borrowing authority, for the quarter ended December 31, 1952 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"House Resolution 601

"Resolution memorializing Congress with respect to the enactment of Federal laws to insure equal opportunity for employment, security of persons, full and equal participation in the Nation's political life and strengthening of the administrative machinery for the protection of civil rights

"Whereas the Democratic Party in its platform, adopted July 24, 1952, promised to continue efforts to eradicate discrimination through Federal as well as State and local action, advocating Federal laws to insure 'equal opportunity for employment,' 'security of persons,' 'full and equal participation in the Nation's political life,' and strengthening of 'the administrative machinery for the protection of civil rights'; and

"Whereas the Republican platform, adopted July 10, 1952, declared that while 'primary responsibility' lies with the States, 'the Federal Government should take supplemental action * * * to oppose discrimination against race, religion, or national origin'; and

"Whereas it is evident that neither party should be allowed to forget the importance of its stand on civil rights made at a time when each was endeavoring to obtain the support of the American voter, since both parties have promised to make advances in this vital sphere of domestic action, which has such an important impact on our foreign relations; and

"Whereas it is imperative that pressures never be relaxed to secure these rights of which the Federal Constitution that gave birth to our Nation speaks so movingly; and

"Whereas, although much progress has been made, it is also obvious that much remains to be accomplished; and

"Whereas a group of distinguished Senators headed by Mr. HUMPHREY and including Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. NEELY, and Mr. PASTORE, have caused to be introduced in the Senate of the United States seven bills and a concurrent resolution dealing with various aspects of the civil-rights questions, based upon the famous 1947 report of the President's Committee on Civil Rights, which report still stands as the yardstick for legislation on the subject; and

"Whereas these bills according to the statement accompanying them in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD contain proposals to make lynching a Federal crime, to provide penalties for discrimination in interstate transportation, outlawing the poll tax as a condition of voting, to reorganize the Department of Justice for the protection of civil rights, to protect the right to political participation, to strengthen the laws relating to convict labor, peonage, slavery and involuntary servitude, to amend and supplement existing civil-rights statutes, and to establish a joint congressional committee on civil rights: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the Rhode Island General Assembly, being in full accord with the broad program for civil rights that is the objective of Senate 462, Senate 463, Senate 464, Senate 465, Senate 466, Senate 467, and Senate 468, now pending in Congress and realizing that this program is fully consistent with the traditions of our democracy, respectfully requests the Congress of the United States to enact said proposed bills; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state be and he is hereby authorized to transmit duly

certified copies of this resolution to the presiding officer of each body in Congress and to the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in said Congress with special request to the Rhode Island Members that each should work for the passage of the aforementioned bills."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota; to the Committee on Finance:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 16

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to amend the Internal Revenue Code, or Federal tax laws, to eliminate the tax on admissions to grandstands, concessions, and amusements operated by county fairs

"Be it resolved by the Senate of the State of South Dakota (the House of Representatives concurring therein):

"Whereas there are in operation in the United States numerous county fairs, which are essential to community life, particularly beneficial and educational to those engaged in agriculture, and have become a tradition in the life and development of agricultural communities; and

"Whereas such county fairs are so operated and conducted that no part of the net earnings inure to the benefit of any stockholders or members of the associations conducting the same, and proceeds from admissions, or other income of such fairs, are used exclusively for the improvement, maintenance, and operation of such fairs, and

"Whereas the Internal Revenue Code, or Federal tax laws, have been interpreted as providing for the imposition and collection of a tax on all admissions to grandstands, concessions, and amusements used or conducted by county fairs where a charge for admission is made; and

"Whereas, such tax is an additional item of expense to be borne by such county fairs, which seriously affects not only the continuance of such fairs in some instances, but also the ability to improve and maintain such fairs in the manner demanded by the public: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the Senate of the State of South Dakota, the House of Representatives concurring therein, do memorialize the Congress of the United States to amend the present Internal Revenue Code, or Federal tax laws, by exempting from admission taxes the admissions to grandstands, concessions, and other amusements used or conducted by county fairs; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to United States Senators KARL MUNDT and FRANCIS CASE and to Members of Congress HAROLD O. LOVRE and E. Y. BERRY, and to the presiding officers of the United States Senate and House of Representatives.

"REX TERRY,
Lieutenant Governor,
President of the Senate.
"HOBART H. GATES,
Speaker of the House.
"NIELS P. JENSEN,
Secretary of Senate.
"W. J. MATSON,
Chief Clerk."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution N

"Concurrent resolution urging appointment of Hon. Elmer W. Cart as a member of Interstate Commerce Commission

"Be it resolved by the Senate of the State of North Dakota (the House of Representatives concurring therein):

"Whereas it appearing that there are two appointments to be made by the President of

the United States to the Interstate Commerce Commission; and

"Whereas it appearing that the Honorable Elmer W. Cart, president of the North Dakota Public Service Commission, is being considered for such appointment; and

"Whereas the said Elmer W. Cart is a North Dakota farm owner, and is a past member of the North Dakota House of Representatives; whereas, he has had over 10 years' experience as a public-service commissioner of this State, over 4 years of experience as a practitioner before the Interstate Commerce Commission in matters involving rates and services of transportation agencies; whereas, he is a member of the Association of Interstate Commerce Commission Practitioners, a member of the executive committee of the National Association of Railroad and Utilities Commissioners, and president of the Midwest Conference of Railroad and Utilities Commissioners, he is deemed eminently qualified for appointment to the Interstate Commerce Commission: Therefore be it

"Resolved by the senate of this 33d legislative assembly (the house of representatives concurring therein), That the President of the United States is hereby respectfully memorialized and urged to appoint Hon. Elmer W. Cart as a member of the Interstate Commerce Commission, and that the Senate confirm said appointment when and if made; be it further

"Resolved, That the Senators and Representatives of the State of North Dakota in the Congress of the United States be requested to put forth every honorable effort to secure said appointment and confirmation; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded forthwith by the secretary of state to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate, the chairman of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to the Senators and Representatives in Congress from the State of North Dakota, and the chairman of the Republican National Committee.

"C. P. DAHL,
President of the Senate.
"EDWARD LENO,
Secretary of the Senate.
"WALTER BUBEL,
Speaker of the House.
"V. L. GILBREATH,
Chief Clerk of the House."

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Arizona; to the Committee on Finance:

"House Memorial 7

"Memorial relating to the Federal excise tax on ladies' handbags

"To the Congress of the United States:

"Your memorialist respectfully represents:

"The Federal excise tax on ladies' handbags was imposed during World War II to restrict consumer purchases and to keep basic raw materials, then in short supply, primarily available for war use.

"Neither reason for continuing this tax exists any longer. None of the materials used in the manufacture of handbags is in short supply.

"Consumer resistance to the tax has resulted in unemployment and business failures of manufacturers and retailers of handbags.

"The tax on handbags is economically and socially unjustifiable. It is a tax on a commodity that is definitely a necessity. It is an inequitable and discriminatory tax in that it falls on women only who pay the tax.

"Wherefore your memorialist, the House of Representatives of the State of Arizona, prays that the Congress repeal the excise tax on ladies' handbags."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Idaho; to the Committee on Finance:

"House Joint Memorial 4

"To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled:

"We, your memorialists, the Legislature of the State of Idaho, respectfully represent that—

"Whereas the Federal Government presently derives over \$2 billion annually from automotive excise taxes of which about \$800 million is from fuel tax, originally imposed as emergency taxes during the depression period, increasing during World War II and increased again in 1951; and

"Whereas the imposition of these Federal taxes is an infringement on the tax source originally reserved to the States for the development of their highways and is counter to the expressed policy of the Federal Government; and

"Whereas the critical inadequacy of important segments of our highways has created a virtual crisis for highway transportation which is as critical as any emergency facing our country today; and

"Whereas the State of Idaho is in need of additional revenues for the construction and maintenance of its highways, but is experiencing extreme difficulty in its efforts to obtain additional revenue needed for this purpose because of the magnitude of the existing overall tax burden now imposed upon the motor-using public: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the 32d legislative assembly of the State of Idaho most urgently pray that the Federal Government retire immediately from the field of motor fuel taxation and as soon as possible repeal all of the Federal automotive excise taxes; be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Idaho be authorized and he is hereby directed to immediately forward certified copies of this memorial to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America and to the Senators and Representatives in Congress from this State.

"This joint memorial passed the house on the 17th day of February 1953.

"R. H. YOUNG, Jr.,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.
"This joint memorial passed the senate on the 26th day of February 1953.

"EDSON H. DEAL,
President of the Senate.
"I hereby certify that the within house joint memorial 4 originated in the house of representatives during the 32d session of the Legislature of the State of Idaho.

"PAT WELKER,
Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Idaho; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"House Joint Memorial 2

"To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress Assembled:

"We, your memorialists, the Legislature of the State of Idaho, assembled in its 32d session, do respectfully represent that—

"Whereas the United States has a sacred trust to defend liberty wherever it can in the world, and, even more important, to preserve and protect it in the United States; and

"Whereas preservation of civil rights under the Constitution and the Bill of Rights is of paramount importance; and

"Whereas the Constitution of the United States provides that the terms of any treaty between the United States and any foreign nation shall be the supreme law of the land; and

"Whereas the United States has become involved in many and complex treaties, compacts, and international agreements which could threaten our civil rights and the freedom and liberty guaranteed by the United States Constitution and the Bill of Rights: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the 32d session of the Legislature in the State of Idaho (the Senate concurring), That we hereby urge upon the Congress of the United States to pass House Joint Resolution 57, introduced in the United States House of Representatives in the 83d Congress, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, as follows:

"ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. Treaties made under the authority of the United States and international agreements entered into by the President or by any other officer or agency of the United States shall be void to the extent that they abridge, abrogate, nullify, subordinate, or interfere with any and all of the rights and freedoms guaranteed to citizens of the United States by the Constitution of the United States.

"SEC. 2. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within 7 years from the date of its submission"; be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Idaho be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to send copies of this joint memorial to the President of the United States and to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States.

"This joint memorial passed the house on the 14th day of February 1953.

"R. H. YOUNG, JR.,

"Speaker of the House of Representatives.

"This joint memorial passed the senate on the 23d day of February 1953.

"EDSON H. DEAL,

"President of the Senate.

"I hereby certify that the within House Joint Memorial 2 originated in the house of representatives during the 32d session of the Legislature of the State of Idaho.

"PAT WELKER,

"Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Joint Resolution 1

"Joint resolution requesting the Congress to admit Hawaii as a State

"Whereas the 83d Congress of the United States of America has before it for consideration legislation to enable Hawaii to form a state government and to enter the Union as a new State; and

"Whereas such legislation is the culmination of decades of application by the people of Hawaii for admission as a State, and of increasing progress in achieving this goal; and

"Whereas both the Senate and the House of Representatives of the Congress have separately and jointly held exhaustive hearings on the question of statehood for Hawaii, resulting in favorable reports in every instance; and

"Whereas the House of Representatives passed legislation to make Hawaii a State during the 80th Congress, and again during the 81st Congress, and the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs reported such legislation favorably to the floor of the Senate during the 81st Congress and during the 82d Congress; and

"Whereas both the Republican and Democratic national platforms of 1952 unequivocally supported statehood for Hawaii; and

"Whereas President Dwight D. Eisenhower has stated and reiterated his approval of immediate statehood for Hawaii; and

"Whereas the Territory of Hawaii has been an organized territory of the United States of America for more than half a century, and the people of Hawaii are entitled to a decision by the Congress as to their aspirations for statehood: Now, therefore, be it

"Enacted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii:

"SECTION 1. The Congress of the United States of America is hereby respectfully requested and petitioned to give immediate consideration to the legislation now pending in the said Congress to enable Hawaii to become a State and to admit Hawaii to the Union as a State without further delay.

"SEC. 2. This legislature does hereby reaffirm, reassert, and restate the desire and demand of the people of the Territory of Hawaii for admission to the Union as a State.

"SEC. 3. Duly certified copies of this joint resolution shall be forwarded to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, the Chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the said Senate, the Chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of said House of Representatives, the Delegate to Congress from Hawaii, and the Secretary of the Interior.

"SEC. 4. This joint resolution shall take effect upon its approval.

"Approved this 6th day of March A. D. 1953.

"SAMUEL WILDER KING,

"Governor of the Territory of Hawaii."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Delaware, expressing its recognition and appreciation of the assumption of the powers of Government by the new national administration; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See joint resolution printed in full when presented by Mr. WILLIAMS (for himself and Mr. FREAR) on March 6, 1953, p. 1668, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

A resolution adopted by the city council of the city of Boston, Mass., relating to the granting of citizenship rights to all aliens who have served in the Armed Forces of the United States during the Korean conflict; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Resolutions adopted by the American Academy of General Practice, Tarrant County Chapter, and the Brazoria County Medical Society, of Alvin, both of the State of Texas, protesting against any extension of the social-security program; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by the 1952 convention of Tau Beta Pi Association, at Norman, Okla., favoring the proposal that all graduate engineers entering the Armed Forces be employed in a professional engineering capacity commensurate with their training and experience; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LANGER:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution K

"Resolution protesting passage of United States Senate bill 281

"Whereas S. 281 of the 83d Congress introduced January 9, 1953, appears to discriminate against the best interests of the people of North Dakota; and

"Whereas the North Dakota Public Service Commission has previously opposed similar legislation; and

"Whereas the Governor of the State of North Dakota is also opposed to such legislation: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the Senate of the State of North Dakota (the House of Representatives concurring therein) do hereby protest the passage of United States Senate bill 281, and request the Secretary of the Senate to send a copy of this resolution to the Members of the Senate and House in Washington, D. C.

"C. P. DAHL,

"President of the Senate.

"EDWARD LENO,

"Secretary of the Senate.

"WALTER BUBEL,

"Speaker of the House.

"V. L. GILBREATH,

"Chief Clerk of the House."

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of North Dakota; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

"House Resolution 8

"Resolution requesting the United States Fish and Wildlife Service to allow shooting hours of one-half hour before sunrise to sunset for migratory waterfowl

"Whereas the State of North Dakota is one of the few States that raises more ducks within its borders than are shot in the State during the hunting season; and

"Whereas migratory waterfowl have been causing excessive damage to the farmers of the State of North Dakota through the destruction of grain after it has been swathed or shocked; and

"Whereas the early onset of cold weather in this State and the resulting southern migration of migratory waterfowl has the practical effect of preventing hunting after the 1st of November, and therefore the hunters of the State of North Dakota do not benefit from the length of the hunting season; and

"Whereas daily bag limits will prevent an undue harvest of migratory waterfowl regardless of the shooting hours set by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of North Dakota, That the United States Fish and Wildlife Service is hereby requested to set the daily shooting hours for migratory waterfowl from one-half hour before sunrise to sunset; be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded by the chief clerk of the house of representatives to the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, and to North Dakota Senators WILLIAM LANGER and MILTON R. YOUNG and Representatives USHER L. BURDICK and OTTO KRUEGER.

"WALTER BUBEL,

"Speaker of the House.

"V. L. GILBREATH,

"Chief Clerk of the House."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota; to the Committee on Finance:

"House Concurrent Resolution P

"Concurrent resolution memorializing Congress to eliminate all motor vehicle fuel tax, leaving such field of taxation exclusively for the State, and bringing to an end the matching of Federal funds for highway purposes

"Whereas the Federal Government has for some years last past taxed motor fuel on the theory that the money so raised would be used to match State funds for highway construction, reconstruction and development in the several States; and

"Whereas the several States have taxed motor vehicle fuel for the same purpose, the Federal Government however requiring that all moneys raised thereby in the State should be appropriated and used solely for construction, reconstruction, repair and maintenance of public highways and payment for the obligations incurred in the construc-

tion, reconstruction, repair and maintenance of public highways; and

"Whereas approximately two-thirds of the moneys raised by the Federal Government in the taxation of motor vehicle fuel has been diverted for other than highway purposes; and

"Whereas the combined Federal and State tax on motor vehicle fuels has reached the point where such fuels cannot stand any more tax burden; and

"Whereas the repeal of all Federal motor vehicle taxes would permit and justify the State in increasing the motor vehicle fuel tax in the amount thus eliminated in Federal taxation, leaving them in a position to spend all motor fuel taxes for the purpose of construction, reconstruction, repair and maintenance of public highways: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of North Dakota (the senate concurring therein), That the 33d Legislative Assembly of the State of North Dakota goes on record as favoring the elimination of all Federal motor vehicle fuel taxes; be it further

Resolved, That a duly attested copy of this concurrent resolution be sent by the secretary of state to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, to the Senators and Representatives in Congress from the State of North Dakota, to the United States Commissioner of Public Roads, and to the Secretary of the Senate, and to the Clerk of the House of Representatives of all other States where the legislative assembly is now in session.

"WALTER BUBEL,

"Speaker of the House.

"V. L. GILBREATH,

"Chief Clerk of the House.

"C. P. DAHL,

"President of the Senate.

"EDWARD LENO,

"Secretary of Senate."

(The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.)

By Mr. SALTONTALL (for himself and Mr. KENNEDY):

A resolution of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"Resolution relative to acts of persecution reported to be committed against the members of religious faiths and their institutions in Russia and its satellite countries

"Whereas it is reliably reported that certain inhabitants of Russia and its satellite countries are being persecuted on account of their religious faith and nationality to an extent abhorrent to modern civilized nations: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives of the General Court of Massachusetts affirms its conviction and belief that freedom and equality of mankind, regardless of race, creed, or color, is indispensable to the maintenance of any modern civilization and views with alarm any violation of these sacred principles; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be forwarded forthwith by the secretary of the Commonwealth to the presiding officers of both branches of Congress and to the Members thereof representing this Commonwealth.

"House of representatives, adopted, February 25, 1953.

"LAWRENCE R. GROVE, Clerk.

"A true copy.

"Attest:

"EDWARD J. CRONIN,

"Secretary of the Commonwealth."

(The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, identical with the foregoing, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.)

By Mr. MARTIN:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Pennsylvania; to the Committee on Finance:

"Whereas an excise tax on gasoline, which form of taxation is the rightful prerogative of the several States, is presently being levied by both the United States of America and the several States; and

"Whereas from time to time the United States has changed its rate of taxation on this commodity which action makes it increasingly difficult for the respective States to develop a comprehensive tax program to provide revenues for the improvement and maintenance of their highways: Therefore be it

Resolved (if the house of representatives concurs), That the general assembly of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania memorialize the Congress of the United States to enact such legislation as will—

"(1) Return to each State without restriction all Federal taxes on gasoline collected therein until such time as the individual State is able to enact legislation as may be necessary to permit it to collect such tax;

"(2) Eliminate the tax on gasoline now collected by the United States as soon as the individual States have enacted legislation as may be necessary to permit the State to collect the tax;

"(3) Eliminate Federal aid for highways except in those States where the revenues produced by a tax of 2 cents per gallon of gasoline is less than present Federal aid allocations to such States;

"(4) Change the present functions of the Federal Bureau of Public Roads so that it would become a consultative and advisory engineering agency which would collect, correlate, and disseminate information relative to the design, construction, maintenance, and operation of highways and bridges and the materials used therefor; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of the Senate of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania be directed to forward copies of this resolution upon its passage to the President of the United States, the Secretary of the United States Senate, the Chief Clerk of United States House of Representatives, to all Members of the Pennsylvania congressional delegation, to the Governors of all other States, and to the presiding officers of the legislative bodies of all other States."

(The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Pennsylvania, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.)

By Mr. MAYBANK:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

"Concurrent resolution petitioning the Interstate Commerce Commission to suspend proposed tariffs on agricultural lime

"Whereas farmers and all agricultural agencies are actively participating in a long-range farm program for the betterment of the country, of agriculture, and farm people throughout the States; and

"Whereas the use of agricultural lime as a soil conditioner is an important step in the long-range program; and

"Whereas both State and Federal agencies have accelerated the liming program in South Carolina; and

"Whereas, with the accelerated program, South Carolina is using only one-fifth of the tonnage of agricultural lime estimated as annual needs; and

"Whereas producers of ground limestone, marl, etc., known as agricultural lime, state that car shortages and rate increases previously granted carriers have deterred farmers from purchasing lime needs; and

"Whereas present carrier rates are not conducive to the liming program; and

"Whereas unless said program is accelerated, producers in South Carolina declare they will be forced to discontinue mining; and

"Whereas crushed rock, road aggregate, crushed limestone, agricultural limestone, marl, etc., are loaded and unloaded under practically same transportation conditions; and

"Whereas the proposed tariff in SFTB Tariff No. 388H is discriminatory against agricultural lime; and

"Whereas the Commission of Agriculture for South Carolina on December 22, 1952, did file a protest and request suspension; and

"Whereas ICC has ordered I. and S. Docket 6067 to suspend Agent Spaninger's ground limestone tariff ICC 1315 and supplements and unless otherwise ordered to be deferred to and including August 15, 1953; and

"Whereas statement of pleadings must be filed with the Interstate Commerce Commission in March 1953: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the senate (the house of representatives concurring), That the Interstate Commerce Commission be informed that the General Assembly of South Carolina, on behalf of both the State's limestone producers and the soil-reclamation program, protests the discrimination against agricultural lime in the tariff proposals in Agent Spaninger's ground limestone tariff ICC 1315; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the director of agricultural research at Clemson College, the South Carolina Public Service Commission, and the commissioner of agriculture as a request to present such pleadings to the ICC on I. and S. Docket 6067 so as to protect the interest of the limestone producers and farmers in South Carolina; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to each of the two United States Senators and to each Member of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States from South Carolina."

POWER OF INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION TO DISCONTINUE CERTAIN RAILROAD SERVICES—JOINT RESOLUTION OF NORTH CAROLINA LEGISLATURE

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, I present a certified copy of Senate Resolution 103, adopted by the General Assembly of North Carolina, session of 1953, which I ask may be printed in the RECORD and then referred to the proper committee for consideration.

The resolution expresses opposition to Senate bill 281, to amend section 1 (17) (a), section 13 (3), and section 13 (4) of the Interstate Commerce Act in order to extend to the Interstate Commerce Commission power to prescribe the discontinuance of certain railroad services in intrastate commerce when found to be unreasonably discriminatory against or to constitute an undue burden on interstate commerce, which is now pending before the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce,

and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate Resolution 103

Joint resolution requesting the Senators and the Members of the House of Representatives from North Carolina in the Congress of the United States to vote against Senate bill 281, entitled "A bill to amend section 1 (17) (a), section 13 (3), and section 13 (4) of the Interstate Commerce Act in order to extend to the Interstate Commerce Commission power to prescribe the discontinuance of certain railroad services in intrastate commerce when found to be unreasonably discriminatory against or to constitute an undue burden on interstate commerce"

Whereas it is the sense of the General Assembly of North Carolina that the passage of Senate bill 281 will take from the North Carolina Utilities Commission and from the regulatory commission of other States the right to regulate railroad services in intrastate commerce, and will give additional powers to a Federal agency over matters which are purely local being intrastate in character, and therefore unrelated to interstate commerce; and

Whereas the passage of such a bill would impose upon the Interstate Commerce Commission additional work which is now being performed by State regulatory bodies in an efficient, satisfactory manner, and with a knowledge of local conditions that the Interstate Commerce Commission does not have and cannot readily obtain: Be it

Resolved by the senate (the house of representatives concurring):

SECTION 1. That the United States Senators and Members of the House of Representatives from North Carolina be and they are hereby memorialized and requested to use their influence against the passage of that bill now pending in the United States Congress known as Senate bill 281, relating to further powers of Interstate Commerce Commission over intrastate commerce.

SEC. 2. That a certified copy of this resolution be transmitted by the Governor of North Carolina to each Senator and Representative from North Carolina in the Congress of the United States.

SEC. 3. That this resolution shall be in full force and effect from and after its ratification.

In the general assembly read three times and ratified, this the 3d day of March 1953.

LUTHER H. HODGES,
President of the Senate.
E. T. BOST, Jr.,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

SUBMERGED OIL LANDS—RESOLUTION OF HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF TENNESSEE

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, the Tennessee House of Representatives has adopted a resolution urging Congress not to give away the Nation's resources in the submerged oil lands.

The resolution, adopted by voice vote after an attempt had been made to table it, memorializes Congress to keep these revenues intact for the benefit of education in all the States.

The tabling motion was overwhelmingly defeated by a vote of 70 to 15.

I present the resolution for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and, under

the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

House Resolution 24

Whereas the Supreme Court of the United States has judicially determined that the oil off the coast of the coastal States belongs to all the States; and

Whereas there is a plan whereby a part of the revenues derived by the United States Government from such oil would be distributed to each of the several States for educational purposes; and

Whereas there is now pending before Congress proposed legislation which would give such oil to those States adjacent to the coastal area, and thus deprive most of the other States, of which Tennessee is one, of any benefit from the production of such oil, and this deprives the school children of their birthright: now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the house of representatives, That any such legislation is detrimental to the school children of Tennessee, and should be defeated; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be furnished to each Member of the Tennessee delegation in Congress.

GRADUATED TOBACCO TAX—RESOLUTION OF NATIONAL AFFAIRS COMMITTEE, LEXINGTON, KY., CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the National Affairs Committee of the Lexington (Ky.) Chamber of Commerce, relating to a graduated tobacco tax.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas there are before the Ways and Means Committee of the United States House of Representatives, two bills, H. R. 1221 and H. R. 1417, which propose a graduated tobacco tax on cigarettes that would replace the present method of uniform taxes on all cigarettes; and

Whereas the tobacco farmers of Kentucky have large investments in land and equipment and have spent millions of dollars to find better methods for growing better tobacco; and

Whereas the Federal tobacco taxes should be designed to deal fairly with all manufacturers of cigarettes, and tobacco growers. A graduated tobacco tax would not do this. Instead, it would open the way for the collapse of the top quality tobacco markets, because it would put high-grade tobacco growers in the position of competing with the growers of low-grade tobacco in the fringe areas of the tobacco-growing States of the Nation; and

Whereas the high-grade-tobacco growers would be thrown into a state of complete depression, as they were in the 1930's when such a bill was passed and experimented with; and

Whereas such a tax would ruin the economy of the States that depend upon quality tobacco for their major farm income, and since there is no valid reason at this time to create an economic crisis in America's tobacco regions: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we, the National Affairs Committee of the Lexington (Ky.) Chamber of Commerce, with the interest of tobacco growers of Kentucky in mind, oppose any type of a graduated tobacco tax; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be presented to members of the Ways and

Means Committee of the House of Representatives, the delegation from Kentucky, Senator ROBERT TAFT, and to all farm organizations and business affected by such a tax.

Submitted and adopted at a meeting held in Lexington, Ky., this 23d day of February 1953.

Arch Mainous, J. A. Fraser, Burton Milward, Malcolm Mason, Ray Wlach, Joseph Mainous, C. W. Gaidry, O. F. Cooke, D. C. Carpenter, Owen Baugh.

DIVISION OF DAIRY HERD IMPROVEMENT INVESTIGATIONS—RESOLUTION OF KANSAS Ayrshire BREEDERS ASSOCIATION, INC., MANHATTAN, KANS.

Mr. SCHOEPEL. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the Kansas Ayrshire Breeders Association, Inc., at their annual meeting in Manhattan, Kans., February 3, relative to the Division of Dairy Herd Improvement Investigations.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the Kansas Ayrshire Breeders' Association feels that any curtailment of the program of the Division of Dairy Herd Improvement Investigations, Bureau of Dairy Industry, is harmful to the entire dairy industry; and

Whereas prior reductions in funds have seriously affected the work of the DHIA, we urgently recommend that the Director of the Budget Bureau be supported in his approval of a DHIA budget of \$421,300 for this next fiscal year.

Whereas the dairy industry represents the largest single phase of the Nation's agriculture and its well-being affects the entire consuming public, we urge the passage of an adequate budget to insure that the tremendous investment the dairymen are making monthly in the DHIA program will result in improved efficiency of the dairy industry for the welfare of all the public.

PROTEST AGAINST TREATMENT OF MINORITY GROUPS BY RUSSIA AND HER SATELLITES—LETTER AND RESOLUTION

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a letter from Bishop Mark I. Lipa, spiritual head of the Albanian-American Orthodox Episcopacy, of Boston, Mass., and a resolution adopted by American citizens of Albanian descent of the cities of Boston, Quincy, Natick, Southbridge, and Worcester, Mass., relating to Senate Resolution 84, remonstrating against the treatment of minority groups by Russia and her satellites.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, will my colleague yield to me?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to his colleague?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, the recent adoption of Senate Resolution 84, protesting against the persecution of minority peoples throughout the world,

has given hope to free people everywhere, among them the sorely oppressed Albanian people.

I ask unanimous consent that my name be added as cosponsor with my colleague the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] in presenting the letter and resolution for reference and printing in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY]? The Chair hears none.

The letter and resolution were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BOSTON, MASS., March 3, 1953.
Senator LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR SALTONSTALL: According to the provisions of Senate Resolution 84, the Congress and the President of the United States have gone on the official record as being in protest against the persecution of all minority peoples throughout the world. This is a stirring action for the Senate and the President of the United States to take at this time. New hope has been given to oppressed peoples all over the world. As the spiritual leader of the Albanian-American Orthodox Episcopacy, I would like to congratulate you for your efforts and sympathies for victimized peoples everywhere.

Albania is often forgotten when resolutions are presented to the Congress and when persecuted minorities are mentioned. At this time I would like to call to your attention a small part of the Communist record for brutality and persecution of the faith in Albania.

The Albanian Orthodox Church has been nationalized and is now under the direct control of the Kremlin. Priests have been tortured, beaten, and imprisoned by their brutal Communist masters. Catholics and members of the Moslem faith have also suffered grievously at the hands of their Russian masters. These facts are not generally known in the Western World as poor communications within Albania and the forcible maintenance of a rigid Iron Curtain around the country has kept press reports scanty.

I am certain that the Albanian Americans would be grateful if you mentioned my thoughts here in the Senate and included our resolution, as enclosed, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Yours in Christian friendship,
MARK I. LIPA.

Resolved, That the Albanian Americans of the orthodox faith who have relatives, friends, and loved ones behind the Iron Curtain in Albania do hereby congratulate the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and the United States Senate for the passage of Senate Resolution 84. The Albanians have suffered grievously under communistic control since 1945 and religion in Albania has undergone particular suppression.

Resolved, that we, American citizens of Albanian descent, are greatly concerned over the systematic extirpation of the orthodox religion, the Moslem religion, and the Roman Catholic religion in Albania. The Communists have used the orthodox church in Albania as an instrument for mobilizing the orthodox population behind Russian policy. Archbishop Kristofor Kissi, the former head of the orthodox church in Albania is now in a Communist jail and a usurper rules in his place. The Communists have virtually wiped out the Catholic church in Albania. The Moslem church in Albania has been shamefully nationalized and is now headed by a Communist stooge, Hafiz Alija.

Resolved, that all Albanian Americans at this meeting and throughout the world who sincerely believe in the principles of the fatherhood of God, do hereby deplore the conspirators in Albania, and the handful of Albanian Americans in this country who follow the dictates of the Communist masters of Albania. The Albanian Americans believe implicitly in the principles of freedom, and religious faith for all men. They deplore the long range aim of Stalinism to extirpate religion. The Albanian Americans hope that Senate Resolution 84, will focus world wide attention upon this anti-religious system of Stalinism which perverts mens' souls, robs man of his conscience and enslaves peoples everywhere.

DISTRIBUTION OF DRY GOODS— RESOLUTION OF THE WHOLESALE DRY GOODS INSTITUTE, INC., NEW YORK, N. Y.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the Wholesale Dry Goods Institute, Inc., of New York, N. Y., concerning the work of the Senate and House Select Small Business Committees.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the Wholesale Dry Goods Institute is the most representative body in wholesale distribution of dry goods; and

Whereas it is instrumental in supplying merchandise to tens of thousands of independent dry goods, department, limited price variety, and general stores throughout the United States; and

Whereas these independent merchants provide an essential link in the chain of distribution between the manufacturer and the ultimate consumer in supplying them with many of the basic necessities of life; and

Whereas they personify, in their endeavors, the American way of life which adheres to the principle of free enterprise; and

Whereas we recognize that the perpetuation of our capitalistic system can only be maintained through the sympathetic cooperation of our representatives in Congress; and

Whereas we, the members of the Wholesale Dry Goods Institute, desire to recognize the excellent work which is being done by the Senate and House Committees on Small Business: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Wholesale Dry Goods Institute, in convention assembled, does hereby express its thanks and grateful appreciation to the aforesaid committees, and to each of their members for their untiring efforts in behalf of small-business enterprises, and particularly of independent merchants throughout the land; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to each member of the aforesaid committees.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. CASE (for himself and Mr. MUNDT):

S. 1230. A bill to provide for the strengthening of the Republic of Korea as an ally against aggression and for the reconstruc-

tion of that country from the ravages of war in resisting aggression; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. CASE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 1231. A bill for the relief of Franz Gerich and Willy Gerich, his minor son;

S. 1232. A bill to amend clause (4) of section 35 of the Bankruptcy Act, as amended;

S. 1233. A bill to further amend the act of July 3, 1943, entitled "An act to provide for the settlement of claims for damage to or loss or destruction of property or personal injury or death caused by military personnel or civilian employees, or otherwise incident to activities of the War Department or of the Army," by removing certain limitations on the nature of personal injury and death claims;

S. 1234. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to transfer to Frederick W. Lee the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to a certain invention;

S. 1235. A bill to continue the effectiveness of the provisions of the act of October 31, 1942, as extended, relating to the adjustment of royalties, for the duration of the national emergency proclaimed December 16, 1950, and 6 months thereafter;

S. 1236. A bill to continue the effectiveness of the act of March 27, 1942, as extended, relating to the inspection and audit of plants, books, and records of defense contractors, for the duration of the national emergency proclaimed December 16, 1950, and 6 months thereafter;

S. 1237. A bill to amend the act of January 12, 1951, as amended, to continue in effect the provisions of title II of the First War Powers Act, 1941;

S. 1238. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, sections 794, 2151, 2153, 2154, and 2388 as extended to continue in effect the provisions thereof;

S. 1239. A bill to further amend the act of January 2, 1942, entitled "An act to provide for the prompt settlement of claims for damages occasioned by Army, Navy, and Marine Corps forces in foreign countries";

S. 1240. A bill to amend the act of July 26, 1947 (61 Stat. 493), relating to the relief of certain disbursing officers;

S. 1241. A bill to make the provisions of section 1362 of title 18 of the United States Code, relating to injury to or interference with communications systems operated or controlled by the United States, applicable to and within the Canal Zone; and

S. 1242. A bill to amend the Contract Settlement Act of 1944 so as to establish a time limitation upon the filing of certain claims thereunder; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCCARRAN:

S. 1243. A bill to amend the War Contractors Relief Act with respect to the definition of a request for relief, to authorize consideration and settlement of certain claims of subcontractors, to provide reasonable compensation for the services of partners and proprietors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARLSON:

S. 1244. A bill relating to the renewal of contracts for the carrying of mail on star routes; and

S. 1245. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in honor of agriculture and the farmers of the United States; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (by request):

S. 1246. A bill for the relief of Arshag Haigan Zelveian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HENNINGS:

S. 1247. A bill for the relief of Doreen McIntyre, Anne McIntyre, David McIntyre and Robert McIntyre; and

S. 1248. A bill for the relief of Dr. John Donald McIntyre; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEHMAN (for himself, Mr. LANGER, Mr. SPARKMAN, and Mr. KEFAUVER):

S. 1249. A bill for the establishment of a temporary National Advisory Committee for the Blind; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

S. 1250. A bill to amend section 604 (b) of the Classification Act of 1949; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MUNDT:

S. 1251. A bill to amend certain provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended, relating to veterans' exemptions; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ANDERSON (for himself, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. CASE, Mr. MORSE, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. HENNING, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. NEELY, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. HILL, Mr. KILGORE, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. HUMPHREY, and Mr. MAGNUSON):

S. 1252. A bill relating to the rights of the several States in tidelands and in lands beneath navigable inland waters, and to the recognition of equities in submerged lands of the Continental Shelf adjacent to the shores of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 1253. A bill to aid in meeting the defense mobilization requirements of the United States by providing for the training or retraining of civilian aviation personnel; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GOLDWATER:

S. 1254. A bill to establish effective means to determine Communist domination in unions and to eliminate Communists from positions of influence and control in labor unions; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 1255. A bill to amend section 13 of the act of March 4, 1915 (38 Stat. 1169), as amended (U. S. C., title 46, sec. 672 (a)), and secs. 5 and 302 of the act of June 29, 1936 (49 Stat. 1935 and 1992), as amended (U. S. C., title 46, secs. 672 (a) and 1132); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 1256. A bill to amend the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1257. A bill to provide for designation of the United States Veterans' Administration hospital now being constructed at Seattle, Wash., as the Hiram R. Gale Memorial Hospital; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. NEELY:

S. 1258. A bill to provide increased annuities to certain civilian officials and employees who performed service in the construction of the Panama Canal, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 1259. A bill for the relief of Anastasia Kondylis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACKSON:

S. 1260. A bill for the relief of Elfriede Else Pope; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDERSON:

S. 1261. A bill relating to the disposition of moneys received from the national forests; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. ANDERSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. J. Res. 55. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the direct popular election of President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. HUMPHREY when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

SURPLUS FOOD AND CLOTHING FOR KOREA

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my colleague, the senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], I introduce for appropriate reference a bill, the purpose of which is to provide surplus food and clothing for Korea. I ask unanimous consent that I may make a brief statement, and read a one-page letter which I have addressed to the Secretary of Agriculture.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the Senator from South Dakota may proceed.

The bill (S. 1230) to provide for the strengthening of the Republic of Korea as an ally against aggression and for the reconstruction of that country from the ravages of war in resisting aggression, introduced by Mr. CASE (for himself and Mr. MUNDT), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I have today written a letter to the Secretary of Agriculture, which reads as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, D. C., March 9, 1953.
The Honorable EZRA T. BENSON,
Secretary, Department of Agriculture,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Attached you will find a copy of an informal draft of a bill which I propose to introduce in the Senate today which would authorize you to sell the Republic of Korea food and clothing commodities and to receive in payment legal currency of the Republic of Korea. The exact form and details are subject to revision, of course, but I hope that the general proposition will appeal to you and may have your support.

You will note that the bill also directs the Treasury to credit such currency against debentures of the Commodity Credit Corporation and to place it in a Korean Reconstruction Fund and creates a Joint Committee of the Congress to investigate conditions in Korea and recommend a program of reconstruction through the use of the fund so created.

On February 26, the Associated Press reported Korean Defense Minister Shin Tae Young as saying: "The ROK soldier is getting only about one-third the calories he needs from rice and a few side dishes."

Last week, in the Senate Committee on Armed Services we heard Lt. Gen. James Van Fleet say that both the military and civilian populations of South Korea were living on a diet below that which we provide for our prisoners of war under the Geneva convention.

General Van Fleet also testified that fewer South Korean troops would go to the hospital, that more South Korean men could qualify for military service, that efficiency at the front would be improved if they had a better diet. He also said that many of the civilians are wearing the ragged remnants of the clothes they had on their backs when the invasion took place almost 3 years ago.

Eventually, the United States will rehabilitate South Korea. That would be in keeping with our traditions and the spirit of our people toward an ally to say nothing of the destruction occasioned by our own troop movements.

Why not help ourselves by helping the South Koreans now—using some of the fiber and food products which the Commodity Credit Corporation is buying—thereby translating these growing stocks into strength at the front and providing the local currency funds that can be used in Korean rehabilitation later on?

Using food to win the war and build the peace beats putting bluing on potatoes or burning wheat or killing pigs.

Respectfully submitted.

FRANCIS CASE,
United States Senator, South Dakota.

I may say that this is in keeping with policies which the United States has followed in connection with the rehabilitation of other allies at present associated with us in war. Whenever foodstocks are approaching the point of deterioration, instead of keeping them on hand, it seems to me that if it is possible we should convert such stocks into food and distribute it to the South Korean soldiers at the front, so as to improve their condition and morale and help to provide more South Korean soldiers for the front. Likewise, the legal currency of Korea should be acquired so that it may be used for the reconstruction of Korea following the war.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized, through the facilities of the Commodity Credit Corporation to acquire domestic supplies of wool, cotton, grains, dairy, poultry and meat products and to sell and deliver such commodities to the Republic of South Korea in an amount not exceeding \$500 million under the authority of this act, and to accept legal currency of the Republic of Korea in payment therefor. In carrying out the provisions of this section, the Secretary of Agriculture shall, insofar as practicable, utilize stocks of such commodities as may be acquired by the Commodity Credit Corporation or the Secretary in carrying out other provisions of existing law.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to receive from the Secretary of Agriculture currency of the Republic of Korea acquired pursuant to the authority of section 1 of this act and to credit such receipts in payment for and retirement of debentures or other evidences of indebtedness of the Commodity Credit Corporation to the Treasury and to deposit this currency in a special fund for Korean reconstruction and rehabilitation.

SEC. 3. There is hereby created a Joint Select Committee on Korean Reconstruction and Rehabilitation to consist of 5 members from the Senate of the United States to be named by the President of the Senate and 5 members from the House of Representatives to be named by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. This committee shall investigate the economic and social conditions of South Korea growing out of the resistance of the Republic of Korea to aggression and shall report its findings to the Congress not later than Jan-

uary 15, 1954, together with its recommendations for the reconstruction and rehabilitation of South Korea through the use of the Korean Reconstruction and Rehabilitation Fund provided by section 2 of this act. The expenses of such committee shall be provided from the contingent funds of the Senate and House of Representatives by appropriate resolution.

DISPOSITION OF MONEYS RECEIVED FROM NATIONAL FORESTS

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to facilitate the development, management, and use of public recreation areas and facilities, and for the improvement of wildlife habitat in the national forests, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that the bill, together with a statement prepared by me, explaining the bill, be printed in the body of the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1261) relating to the disposition of moneys received from the national forests, introduced by Mr. Anderson, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the 14th paragraph under the heading "Forest Service" of the act of March 4, 1913, as amended by section 212 of the Department of Agriculture Organic Act of 1944 (U. S. C., 1946 edition, title 16, sec. 501) is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "Ten percent of all moneys received from the national forests during each fiscal year, but not to exceed \$5,500,000 in any year, shall be available at the end thereof to be expended by the Secretary of Agriculture for the development, maintenance, and operation within the national forests of facilities and areas for public use; to provide for adequate safety, sanitation and health in connection with uses of the national forests; and to improve and maintain wildlife habitat on the national forests: *Provided*, That no part of such moneys shall be used for the acquisition of land; and *provided further*, That the Secretary shall make a report to the Congress annually, showing the purpose for which the funds are expended."

The statement presented by Mr. ANDERSON is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR ANDERSON

There are at present 4,700 public-recreation areas in the national forests on which the Forest Service has constructed and is maintaining to the extent possible the camp and picnic grounds and winter sports areas, and other improvements for recreational purposes. The increased use of these areas, as shown by the above table, has resulted in overcrowding on weekends and holidays, and consequently the overtaxing of sanitary and water facilities. It is my understanding that the Public Health Service has inspected a number of these areas and recommends improvements in the sanitation facilities and water systems. Most of these facilities and improvements were built by the Civilian Conservation Corps in the 1930's. Due mostly to lack of funds for maintenance and upkeep, these facilities, especially sanitary facilities, have deteriorated

and require major repairs or replacements. This, together with increasing population and an increase in the number of people visiting the national forests has brought about a critical need for additional facilities, including safe water and sanitary facilities and proper fire protection.

A survey has recently been completed by the Forest Service to determine the amount of funds needed to provide adequate sanitation and care at the 4,700 existing forest recreational areas, the additional capital investment needed to provide for sanitary improvements and other necessary facilities required to accommodate the present recreational use on the national forests in a safe and satisfactory manner, and funds needed annually to operate and maintain all recreational areas after rehabilitation of the existing areas has been completed and additional capital investments made for expansion. A summary of the results of this survey follows:

The recreational use of the national forests has long been recognized as one of the major resources of the forest. The use of the national forest for recreation is increasing year by year, creating the need for additional care, maintenance, and improvement of the recreation areas. The increase of funds allocated by Congress for the care and improvement of these areas has not been in proportion to the increase in their use and need. The table below was compiled by the Forest Service and gives a list of the funds available by year from 1948 to date for recreation and wildlife work, together with the total number of visits per year to these recreation areas.

Funds available for recreation and wildlife work—Funds available for sanitation and care of public-use areas and for wildlife management

Fiscal year:		
1948	-----	\$1,190,601
1949	-----	1,355,703
1950	-----	1,306,880
1951	-----	1,314,775
1952	-----	1,357,615
1953	-----	1,358,315

Data on sanitation, cleanup, maintenance of improvements, and use at public use areas

	Funds available			Calendar year	Total recreation visits (thousands)
	Sanitation and cleanup	Maintenance of improvements	Total		
1948	\$543,986	\$515,000	\$1,058,986	1948	24,000
1949	681,753	531,000	1,212,753	1949	26,000
1950	620,240	554,000	1,174,240	1950	27,000
1951	627,730	551,000	1,178,730	1951	30,000
1952	652,900	570,000	1,222,900	1952	31,000
1953	646,100	570,000	1,216,100	-----	-----

¹ Estimate.

1. Operation and maintenance of existing recreation facilities:

(a) Funds needed annually for sanitation, cleanup, garbage disposal, and supervision at the 4,700 existing recreation areas.....

\$1,071,000

(b) Funds needed annually for maintenance of improvements and facilities at the 4,700 existing recreation areas.....

1,197,000

Total annual needs for the 4,700 existing recreation areas.....

2,268,000

2. Additional capital investments needed for recreation improvements:

(a) Capital investment needed to provide satisfactory facilities for sanitation and public safety and to rehabilitate all essential existing public use areas and facilities in good condition.....

\$7,169,000

(b) Capital investment needed to expand the capacity of existing areas and to construct new areas necessary to accommodate present use in a safe and satisfactory manner.....

17,135,000

Total capital investment.....

24,304,000

3. Estimate of funds needed annually to operate and maintain all recreation areas after rehabilitation of existing areas has been completed and additional capital investments made for expansion.....

3,200,000

THE WILDLIFE HABITAT MANAGEMENT JOB ON THE NATIONAL FORESTS

In the field of wildlife management, seasons, bag limits, fish and game stocking programs, refuges, and related management tools are all important. However, these are of little value if the environment is unsatisfactory. All fish, game, and nongame animals have certain requirements in terms of food, water, and cover. Moreover these requirements are often different in summer and winter, or even at other seasons. Then, too, animals do best where preferred food, water, and cover are all within their daily travel range. Thus the Forest Service role in wildlife management is a most important one because this Bureau is responsible for the management of large areas of public land. How this land and its cover of trees, shrubs, and grass is managed determines to a large degree how productive the land and waters will be of desirable forms of wildlife.

In the national-forest regions men with specialized training in wildlife management are responsible for leadership in habitat management and cooperative wildlife programs. At present, however, there are only 7 of these technicians for the 10 national-forest regions in the United States and Alaska. As an example of the size of the task involved 1 technician handles the habitat and cooperative program involving 19 million acres of national-forest lands in 11 States.

The habitat management work on the national forests can be roughly placed in two categories: (1) That which is accomplished indirectly through good management of all resources and uses—timber, forage, water, recreation, and fire; and (2) that which can be done directly to develop food, water, or cover.

To meet these basic wildlife management responsibilities would require \$500,000 annually. The expenditure during the past fiscal year was \$134,000.

At the present time the Forest Service lacks funds to engage in the direct form of habitat management. This is unfortunate as there are many projects which would appear to be in the public interest.

The bill which I have introduced today will provide the necessary funds to rehabilitate and maintain present facilities and allow for the gradual expansion and further improvement of recreation areas that is needed in order to properly accommodate the public and protect their health and safety.

The bill provides that no part of the money can be spent for land purchase, and further that a report shall be made to the Congress each year, showing the purposes for which the funds are expended.

DIRECT POPULAR ELECTION OF PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the direct popular election of President and Vice President. I ask unanimous consent that an explanatory statement prepared by me on the joint resolution be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 55) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the direct popular election of President and Vice President, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The statement presented by Mr. HUMPHREY is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HUMPHREY

For 160 years, the United States has been hampered by an obstacle in the path of democratic selection of the Chief Executives. The system has persisted in spite of oft repeated efforts to substitute more rational and democratic methods. Now, in a time when democracy is enduring its severest trial before the peoples of the world, the United States must perform the duties which it has assumed, and lead the free nations of the world in demonstrating that democracy is the best way.

The fundamental principle on which any democracy is founded is that the people governed shall have a voice, a controlling voice in their government. This means that they shall elect their public servants by popular vote, so that the servants are responsible to the people in the most direct way possible. It is also inherent in any democracy that all citizens shall have an equal voice in choosing their public servants. It is inconsistent with our principles that the votes of some of our citizens are worth twice, five times, or ten times as much as others, merely due to their geographic distribution. It is even more inconsistent that in every presidential election, millions of votes are not counted at all. These inconsistencies are difficult to justify in the eyes of the world. The United States should meet the challenge, and reform its outmoded election system in order that it may better reflect the will of the people.

The electoral college system has many defects. Not only is it possible for a man to be elected President of the United States even though more Americans may have voted for his opponent, but this has happened three times in the short history of our country. In 1824, Andrew Jackson polled 50,000 votes more than his nearest rival, John Quincy Adams, but lacked a majority due to the votes received by two other candidates. The election was thrown to the House of Representatives under the provisions of the Constitution. There, through pressure and influence, Adams was chosen to be President.

Again in 1876, Samuel J. Tilden received almost 265,000 votes more than Rutherford B. Hayes. Hayes won the election, however,

through a vote in the Electoral Commission set up to decide the contest.

In 1888, Grover Cleveland received 375,000 votes more than Benjamin Harrison but lost to Harrison through the peculiar distribution of votes in the electoral college.

These three men, Adams, Hayes, and Harrison, were all defeated in the popular election, but nevertheless became President. More voters preferred another candidate in each instance, but due to our election arrangement, the also-ran became the Chief Executive. How can we justly say we believe in majority rule unless we correct the situation which allows this possibility.

There are three factors which contribute to the possibility of a President being chosen without receiving more votes than any other candidate. The first of these factors is that all the electoral votes of a State are cast for the candidate that polls the greatest number of votes in the State. Thus, it makes no difference in the result of an election whether a candidate wins a State by a narrow margin or by a sweeping majority. The votes cast for the losing candidates in a State might just as well not have been cast at all. It is as if all the voters who did not vote for the winning candidate had been disfranchised. They might just as well have stayed home. This may well be the cause of much apathy at election time in this country, particularly in the States which consistently vote one ticket year after year. There are an estimated 37 million people in the United States qualified to vote who do not choose to exercise this fundamental prerogative.

There are further statistics to show the unfortunate effects of the "all-or-nothing" rule, not as spectacular as electing the wrong President, but important nonetheless because they show that the electoral vote does not reflect the will of the people. In 1884, Cleveland received 563,084 popular votes in the State of New York and all of its electoral votes. In the same election, Blaine received 562,001 popular votes, only 1,083 fewer than Cleveland, but got none of the State's electoral votes. The electoral vote cast by the State seemed to indicate that New York was 100 percent behind Cleveland when in actuality, the margin between his support and Blaine's amounted to less than a tenth of a percent of the total vote cast.

In 1932, Herbert Hoover had 15,800,000 popular votes and of these, 13,600,000 brought no electoral votes due to their distribution among the States. Of Mr. Hoover's nearly 16 million votes, only 2 million were reflected in the electoral vote. In 1924, John W. Davis polled 6 million votes which were worthless to him for they brought no electoral votes, while 2 million other popular votes brought him 136 electoral votes. These 2 million votes were infinitely more valuable to Davis than the votes of 6 million other people who happened to be living in the wrong States to make their votes effective.

The second factor which contributes to the possibility of an "also-ran" becoming President of the United States is the fact that under the present electoral college system, each State is given a bonus of two electoral votes over the votes it has due to its population. There are 96 of these bonus votes distributed among the 48 States, and they give an unfair advantage to the voters who reside in the smaller States.

In 1950, the census showed the United States population to be 150,697,361. Thirty-eight States contained 70,453,399 people; the remaining 10 States contained 80,243,962 or 9,790,563 more than the 38 smaller States. But the 10 States have 20 automatic electoral votes while the 38 have 76 automatic votes. The 10 large States have over 6 million more people but 56 fewer electoral votes. The voters in the large States are penalized in that their votes don't count as much as

those from the smaller States due to the two-vote bonus.

The third factor that contributes to the possibility that a President may be elected without having polled the most votes is the fact that a State casts the same number of electoral votes regardless of the number of people who turn out to vote. In the extreme case, a thousand people in New York could cast 47 electoral votes so long as no one else in the State bothered to vote. We don't have to go to the extreme case, however, to find extraordinary situations which actually existed. In the 1952 election, 1 electoral vote in Mississippi represented less than 36,000 popular votes due to the small election day turnout, while in Minnesota 1 electoral vote represented more than 125,000 popular votes. The voter in Minnesota had less than one-third the importance in the final result as the voter in Mississippi. I am sure we all revere and respect the Mississippi voter, but there are few among us, I think, who will maintain that his judgment concerning who should be President is more than three times as astute as that of the Minnesota or Massachusetts voter.

The following table represents other instances of unequal representation which have actually occurred:

In 1912 Wilson received 1 elector per 14,500 votes; Taft received 1 elector per 435,000 votes.

In 1928 Hoover received 1 elector per 48,180 votes; Smith received 1 elector per 172,602 votes.

In 1932 Hoover received 1 elector per 267,149 votes; Roosevelt received 1 elector per 48,351 votes.

In 1948 Truman received 1 elector per 78,123 votes; Dewey received 1 elector per 113,990 votes.

In 1952 Stevenson received 1 elector per 306,646 votes; Eisenhower received 1 elector per 76,764 votes.

The best way to eliminate the possibility that a man will be elected President in spite of the will of the people is to conduct a general popular election for the position. This does away with all the factors which might contribute to the election of a man who has lost the general election. Under the constitutional amendment which I am introducing today, every voter casts one vote, a whole vote, which is just as good and just as important as the vote cast by any other voter in the country. This is the democratic way. This is what we are trying to convince the people of the world to do. This is, in reality, what is implied in the spirit of our Government. This is the final step in the constitutional evolution which began with the Declaration that all men are created equal, and continued with the assertion that no man or woman may be denied the right to vote for arbitrary reasons. Now we must make the suffrage an equal suffrage, and repudiate arbitrary and discriminatory geographical bases for denying or reducing the importance of the votes of some of our citizens.

The electoral college also permits the majority will within a State to be ignored. The best an individual member of the electoral college can do is perform a function which could more efficiently be performed without him. The worst he can do is to refuse to vote as instructed by the voters of his State and substitute his own will for theirs. In 1948, electors of four States repudiated the Democratic candidate and cast ballots for the States-rights candidate. One elector out of 11 from a fifth State, Tennessee, did the same in spite of an overwhelming victory of the Democratic candidate over the States-right candidate in that State. The electors are not legally bound to follow the dictates of their State's electorate, and are free to exercise their discretion as they see fit.

In 1796 three electors disregarded the mandate of the general election, with the result

that John Adams rather than Thomas Jefferson was elected.

A whole State's citizenry may be disfranchised by the action of a handful of men. The sooner this possibility is removed from our election procedures, the better for the American people.

From the voters' point of view, the electoral college only adds to the confusion of election day. The voter wants to vote for the President and Vice President, not for a list of electors whose names he doesn't recognize. Yet in 10 States, only the names of the electors appear on the ballot. In 16 other States, the ballot includes both the names of the candidates and of the electors.

Another reason for abolishing the electoral college is the possible confusion which would result if an elector is unable to carry out the function for which he was chosen. Suppose he dies, or falls to cast his vote on the proper day and in the proper way. Or suppose the Presidential candidate to whom he is pledged becomes ineligible and the elector is freed from his pledge. All of these circumstances have occurred in our history and all of them could have been avoided if the electoral college had been abolished.

Direct popular election of the President and Vice President are not new concepts in our political philosophy. The father of the Constitution, James Madison, strongly favored direct popular election. The man whose counsel and philosophy guided the creation of the Constitution, Benjamin Franklin, also supported this form of election. Andrew Jackson, one of the great Presidents of our history who was more closely in touch with the will of the people than most, emphasized in his first message to Congress the need for direct popular election as a method of democratizing the election process. At best, the electoral college system is the result of a crude compromise, a matter of necessity in order to unite the States at the time of the Constitutional Convention. At worst, it is a device originally created to remove from the hands of the people the selection of the country's Chief Executive. Do we still believe that we must compromise on an issue so basic in a democracy? Do we still believe that the people are not to be trusted in choosing their President?

The answer to both of these questions is clear and it is "No." We have shown countless times that we recognize that the country is strong when the voice of the people is heard. We have removed restrictions on the suffrage three times by constitutional amendment in amendments 14, 15, and 19. In reality, these amendments did not extend the suffrage; they merely recognized contradictions of democracy in our country and removed the contradictions.

We must now continue in the pattern set by our enlightened predecessors, in the tradition of democracy. We must support a direct election of the President and Vice President, recognizing that the present system is defective in guaranteeing the democratic equality of all voters, and that this anachronism must be eliminated.

The process of election as it exists today, promotes an unusual and unfortunate emphasis in presidential campaigning. In the first place, most candidates concentrate on winning majorities in a few large States, realizing that even if these majorities are very slight, they will carry with them all of the electoral votes in the States. These large States contribute a disproportionate number of votes in the electoral college and for this reason the campaigns are disproportionately directed toward these States. The voters in the smaller States are neglected and must choose between the candidates on insufficient evidence. Proof of this campaign emphasis exists in the fact that 17 out of 27 major party candidates for the Presidency since 1900 came from Ohio or New York. In the past 50 years, we have had 3 Presidents from

New York and 3 from Ohio. In the past 70 years, only twice has a President been elected without winning a majority in the State of New York.

I don't mean to detract from the caliber of the Presidents and candidates produced by New York and Ohio, and several of the other large States. However, I would venture to say that there have been other possible candidates from smaller States who weren't given the consideration that might have been due them because of their geographic position. On the other hand, citizens of the smaller States who are not the beneficiaries of vigorous campaigning are often apathetic about voting. We have a nonvoting population of 37 million, an extraordinarily large percentage for a free republic.

Another factor in the peculiar emphases of our campaigns is the unusual importance of minority groups in large doubtful States. Often, presidential candidates must give these groups far more consideration than is healthy in a democracy where the majority is supposed to rule. That minorities can exert an important influence is clearly shown in the election of 1948 when the Progressive Party polled enough votes to swing two important States to the Republican candidate. I use this example because it is one of the few cases where the effect of the vote of a political minority group can be accurately shown. It is more difficult to study the voting patterns of other minority groups because under the secret ballot these votes cannot be separated in the final election returns. However, there is no doubt that certain minority groups receive special treatment in presidential campaigns, and we can be sure that this is not without good reason.

A direct presidential election is needed, then, for many reasons, but all of the reasons are derived from the principle that all votes cast should have equal importance in deciding who is to be President. This principle is basic in our democracy as well as in any other democracy. It means not only that all the votes cast will have the same mathematical importance, but that all votes will be the end product of virtually the same opportunity of choice, as far as possible.

It is our duty to the world as well as to our own citizens to perfect our form of democracy until it is beyond the criticism of principle without execution. We must be the example to the free world not only in our words and ideas, but in our actions and our conduct. We must mean what we say when we dedicate ourselves to a government in which its strength, integrity, and sovereignty are those of its people, as expressed in free, untrammelled elections.

JOINT COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE ALLEGED CRIMES AGAINST HUMANITY IN TOTALITARIAN COUNTRIES

Mr. KENNEDY submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 16), which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring). That there is hereby established a joint committee (hereinafter referred to as the "committee") to be composed of four Members of the Senate, to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and four Members of the House of Representatives, to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. Vacancies in the membership of the committee shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the committee, and shall be filled in the same manner as in the case of the original selection. The committee shall select a chairman from among its members.

Sec. 2. It shall be the duty of the committee—

(a) to make a full and complete investigation and study of the facts and circumstances surrounding atrocities and other crimes against humanity (1) which are alleged to have been committed since June 25, 1950, in the course of hostilities in Korea, and (2) which are alleged to have been committed by forces of totalitarian countries in the course of the efforts of such countries to dominate the free world; and

(b) to report, as soon as practicable during the present Congress to the Senate and the House of Representatives (or to the Secretary of the Senate and the clerk of the House of Representatives if the Congress is not in session) the results of its investigation and study, together with such recommendations as to necessary legislation as it may deem desirable.

Sec. 3. For the purposes of this concurrent resolution, the committee, or any subcommittee thereof authorized by the committee to hold hearings, is authorized (1) to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within or outside the United States, during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the 83d Congress, (2) to hold such hearings, and (3) to require, by subpoena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses, and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary. Subpoena may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee designated by him and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member. The cost of stenographic service to report such hearings shall not exceed 25 cents per hundred words.

Sec. 4. (a) The committee shall have power to employ and fix the compensation of such officers, experts, and employees as it deems necessary in the performance of its duties.

(b) The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed \$50,000, shall be paid one-half from the contingent fund of the Senate and one-half from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives upon vouchers signed by the chairman. Disbursements to pay such expenses shall be made by the Secretary of the Senate out of the contingent fund of the Senate, such contingent fund to be reimbursed from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives in the amount of one-half of the disbursements so made.

NOTICE OF CANCELLATION OF HEARING ON PROPOSED LEGISLATION PERMITTING COMPELLING OF TESTIMONY AND GRANTING IMMUNITY FROM PROSECUTION IN CONNECTION THEREWITH

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, on March 4, 1953, I announced, on behalf of the standing Subcommittee on Improvements in Judicial Machinery of the Committee on the Judiciary, that there was to be a public hearing scheduled for Tuesday, March 10, 1953, at 10 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building on S. 565, permitting compelling of testimony and granting immunity from prosecution in connection therewith.

At this time I desire to announce and give notice that the public hearing so referred to has been cancelled without date.

The subcommittee consists of myself, as chairman, the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER].

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. CASE:

Address delivered by Lt. Gen. Thomas D. White, Air Force Deputy Chief of Staff, before the National Aviation Educational Council at Atlantic City, N. J., February 12, 1953.

By Mr. COOPER:

Address entitled "Lincoln's Path to Greatness," delivered by Hon. CHAUNCEY W. REED, chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, House of Representatives, at the Fayette Lincoln Day banquet, Lexington Ky., February 13, 1953.

By Mr. BYRD:

Statement entitled "Equality of Abstract Individual Rights Under the Constitution" prepared by Charles Hall Davis.

By Mr. MARTIN:

Article entitled "Four Heroic Army Chaplains Honored," written by Benjamin Prager and published in the Army and Navy Legion of Valor magazine.

By Mr. WELKER:

Editorial entitled "Benson, Farmers Agree," published in the Idaho Daily Statesman of March 2, 1953.

By Mr. LANGER:

Letter addressed to him by Mrs. Cora M. Hanssen, of Gebo, Wyo., relative to old age pensions and mineral rights.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT:

Article entitled "Invitation to Anarchy," written by Walter Lippmann and published in the Washington Post of March 9, 1953.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL:

Article entitled "Massachusetts Boy Wins Top Award in Science Search," published in the Washington Star of March 3, 1953, dealing with an award to E. Alan Phillips, of Lincoln, Mass., of the Westinghouse grand science scholarship.

By Mr. THYE:

Article entitled "Where Does Mr. Farmer Come In?" written by W. F. Schilling, and published in the Northfield (Minn.) Independent of March 5, 1953.

By Mr. HENNINGS:

Editorial from St. Louis Post-Dispatch of March 1, 1953, on the establishment of the Ford Foundation's Fund for the Republic.

Editorial comment and newspaper articles relating to observance of 100th anniversary of Washington University, St. Louis, Mo.

By Mr. TAFT:

Article entitled "New Regime's Record Is One To Be Proud Of," written by Gould Lincoln and published in the Washington Evening Star of March 7, 1953.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Texas:

Editorial entitled "Graceful Exit," appearing in the Washington Evening Star of February 27, 1953.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

List of organizations represented at meeting on tariffs and trade in Washington, D. C., on March 5, 1953, and a statement of tariff and trade policy by nationwide industrial, agricultural, and labor groups.

By Mr. ANDERSON:

Editorial from the Nashville Tennessean with reference to the position of that State on the question of oil from submerged lands.

By Mr. JACKSON:

Articles appearing in the Pacific Northwest Public Power Bulletin on the subject of hydro development in Alaska.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

Article entitled "Do Our Schools Fear Freedom?" appearing in the Minneapolis Star. Article entitled "Let's Respect the Dissenting View," written by Paul G. Hoffman and published in the Minneapolis Star of January 23, 1953.

CATTLE AND BEEF PRICES—CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN SENATOR MURRAY AND THE SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, on February 6 I wrote the new Secretary of Agriculture, Ezra Benson, asking him for the answers to a number of questions in which the farmers of Montana are urgently interested. The length and character of the reply I have received from the Secretary indicates that farmers will have to wait a considerable time for all the answers and that their Government has only vague steps in mind for them.

For example, the Secretary informs me that beef prices should become better because of his assistance in having price ceilings removed from cattle. It is difficult to understand how this assertion can be supported at a time when the price of cattle is well below the price ceiling.

One of the questions I addressed to the Secretary concerned his authority under existing law to support livestock prices.

In view of Friday's announcement that the price of beef has fallen to 89 percent of parity—as contrasted with 130 percent a year ago and 92 percent a month ago—it is particularly interesting to find that Secretary Benson admits that he does possess the power, under existing legislation, to support cattle prices.

He raises the question, however, as to what could be done with the beef that might have to be bought. A partial answer to his question is found, I believe, in the story in today's Washington Post about malnutrition in the South Korean Army. Let me quote from this story:

The food crisis in the army of the Republic of Korea has grown so grave that Gen. Paik Sun Yup, its chief of staff, yesterday said he would ask the United Nations for help.

Why can we not work out a plan to ship beef to Korea?

Several of the questions I addressed to the Secretary concerned the availability of credit for cattlemen. The Secretary found little or nothing to be concerned about, but I am sure the farmers of Montana could tell him that credit available to them is not adequate to enable them to hold their cattle instead of sending them to market at signs of falling prices.

The Secretary concludes his reply by saying that no legislation is needed with respect to the type of loans the Department is now authorized to make. I think it is becoming more obvious—contrary to the Secretary's opinion—that the credit program of the Department of Agriculture should be enlarged. I am surprised and disappointed at the Secretary's attitude of standing pat in the present situation, and I believe that the United States Congress should examine thoroughly rural credit programs administered by the Department, with a view to expanding them.

Perhaps the legislation now on the books will be found to be adequate, but if so it is my opinion that loan authorizations will have to be increased materially if we are to supply our farmers with suf-

ficient credit to enable them to get their work done and to market their products in an orderly way, instead of having to liquidate their holdings when credit becomes tight.

This can be done at no public cost, because the loan programs of the Department are on a sound basis and the repayment records are excellent. The Department should be authorized to loan all the money that is needed, based on a sound standard of security; and I can think of no better investment than an investment in a healthy agriculture economy.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in connection with my remarks the letter from Secretary Benson and his answers, and the story in today's Washington Post, entitled "South Korea To Ask U. N. Help in Food Crisis."

There being no objection, the correspondence was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D. C., February 16, 1953.
Hon. JAMES E. MURRAY,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR: This is in reply to your letter of February 6 indicating that the drop in livestock prices has been of serious concern to cattlemen and requesting our views on six questions. Attached are answers to each of these questions. If you require any further information on this problem, please let us know.

Sincerely yours,

EZRA TAFT BENSON,
Secretary.

ANSWER TO QUESTIONS RAISED BY SENATOR JAMES E. MURRAY

Question 1: "Do you believe that the Government should take any action to deal with the problem of declining livestock prices?"

The Department already has taken a number of steps in connection with declining livestock prices. When we took office a little over 3 weeks ago, a drastic drop in cattle prices was in process. Within 7 days a statement was issued which reviewed the factors responsible for the overall decline in farm prices and pointed out that the Department did not expect any major changes in farm prices in the next several months, particularly in view of the continuing high level of consumer income. On the following day, January 29, a public announcement was made that the Department was doing everything possible to have price controls and compulsory grading of meat removed because these controls were contributing to the decline in cattle prices and their removal would strengthen and stabilize prices. This was followed on February 3 by a call to cattle producers to follow an orderly pattern of marketing and to processors and distributors to develop a greater demand for beef. This statement pointed out that while somewhat lower prices than in 1951 and 1952 were anticipated due to the unusual buildup in numbers, the recent breaks in cattle prices appeared to be temporary. A copy of that statement is enclosed.

It is too early to judge what effect the recent decontrol of cattle and meat prices, abandonment of compulsory meat grading, and orderly marketing suggested will have on cattle and meat prices. We anticipate that recent sharp price reductions in consumer prices will move beef more readily into consumption and stabilize prices.

Nevertheless, we are carefully watching the cattle price situation. Any subsequent action taken on cattle prices will be guided by advice obtained from the best men in the livestock and meat industries. Since

taking office we have followed a policy of consulting advisory groups in connection with our commodity programs so as to obtain the best judgment of farmers, farm organizations, and industries. One of these committees, the cotton committee, has already started its meetings and the special dairy committee will meet in Washington beginning on February 17.

Question 2: "Do you under existing legislation have any authority to support livestock prices? If so, specify."

Support of beef-cattle prices is not mandatory under the Agricultural Act of 1949, the authority under which our CCC price support programs are undertaken. Hence, any price-support program for beef cattle would have to be undertaken under the provisions relating to nonmandatory commodities contained in titles III and IV. These two titles authorize the Secretary to support the price of any nonmandatory commodity at a level not to exceed 90 percent of parity. However, in determining whether to undertake a support program and in deciding on the level of support, the Secretary is required to consider eight factors contained in section 401 (b).

There is considerable question as to whether a price-support program for beef cattle can be justified, after considering the eight factors as required by law. One factor that must be considered is the ability to dispose of stocks acquired. To support prices of beef cattle, we would have to buy beef carcasses or cuts. Beef is perishable and its storage under proper conditions is relatively expensive. If extensive purchases were undertaken, we would be faced with serious disposal problems. We probably would not be able to dispose of any large quantities without incurring tremendous losses. Outlets for which donations are authorized could absorb only limited quantities. As a result, in undertaking any such program we would be faced with a real possibility of spoilage and also great loss in money.

The Department has the authority to undertake surplus removal operations for beef cattle under section 32 of the act of August 24, 1935. That act authorizes the Secretary to take action to encourage exports, and to encourage domestic consumption of surplus commodities by diverting them from the normal channels of trade. The method usually used is to purchase commodities and then donate them to eligible outlets, such as the nonprofit school-lunch program, and charitable institutions. However, such purchases must be limited to the quantities for which outlets are available. Furthermore, purchases are not made at any specific support level as in price support, and cannot be made at price levels which reflect a price for the agricultural commodity in excess of 90 percent of parity. The latest report of parity prices indicated that cattle prices were 92 percent of parity on January 15, 1953. The quantity of beef that could be moved through available outlets under a section 32 program would be very small relative to the total supply. Hence, any surplus removal operation for beef probably would have little price effect on beef cattle, except perhaps from a psychological standpoint.

Question 3: "What is the outstanding amount of loans made to cattlemen for the purpose of helping them build their herds?"

We have no information as to the total outstanding amount of loans made to cattlemen for the purpose of helping them build their herds.

On the basis of estimates made by the Federal intermediate-credit banks and production-credit corporations, Farm Credit Administration institutions now are financing approximately \$240 million of cattle loans, consisting of feed-lot loans of \$65 million and range and breeder loans of \$175 million. We have no way of determining how much of this amount represents loans made for the purpose of building herds. However, it is

our opinion that most of this amount represents loans made to finance regular business operations of livestock growers.

The nature of the production and subsistence loans made by the Farmers Home Administration is such that it is not possible to determine the portions of the loans that are outstanding which were advanced for the purchase of cattle.

Under this program, we have encouraged and financed balanced farming operations with farmers obtaining supervised credit assistance. This has included the development and improvement of grasslands and acquiring beef cattle, dairy cattle, hogs, and other livestock enterprises. In some disaster areas, disaster loans have been made by the Farmers Home Administration to stockmen. Some of these loans included funds to replace cattle losses but not to build up herds.

Question 4: "Is it true that the banks are now calling in a large portion of these loans?"

We have no information concerning the extent to which commercial banks or other institutions not financing through Farm Credit Administration institutions may be calling in their cattle loans. Our information is that the institutions rediscussing with the Federal intermediate credit banks are not forcing liquidation of their cattle loans. Information which has come to us would indicate that commercial banks are becoming somewhat more selective in the extension of credit to farmers and stockmen generally.

Question 5: "Do the farm credit agencies of the Federal Government have sufficient powers and funds to assist the cattlemen and the banks in dealing with this situation?"

The institutions under the supervision of the Farm Credit Administration (Federal intermediate credit banks and production credit associations) have the necessary powers to finance loans to cattlemen who can qualify for credit on a sound basis. Funds for that purpose are derived principally through sales of intermediate credit bank debentures in the investment markets. Such debentures are not guaranteed by the Government. While the supply of funds is not unlimited, these institutions would be able to finance a considerable additional volume of sound loans.

The Federal intermediate credit banks do not at this time have the manpower required to handle a greatly increased volume of loans and discounts, in addition to that expected in their normal operations. Should they be called upon to finance a materially greater proportion of the credit required by the cattle industry, it would be necessary to adjust their administrative expense authorizations, by congressional action, to enable them to employ additional personnel and defray other necessary expenses.

In addition to the seasonal and short-term credit facilities of the Farm Credit system referred to above, the Federal land banks have sufficient powers and funds to assist farmers and stockmen who are eligible and can qualify for mortgage loans under the limitations of the laws governing the land banks. In all probability, there are some cattlemen who have sufficient equities in their real estate to enable them to obtain Federal land bank loans. A Federal land bank loan cannot exceed 65 percent of the normal value of the farm mortgaged and loans to any one borrower cannot exceed \$100,000.

Production and subsistence loans made by the Farmers Home Administration are for the purpose of assisting operators of family-type farms who cannot get satisfactory credit elsewhere, to acquire productive livestock farm machinery, and for other operating expenses necessary for successful farming. Such loans are made primarily to acquire the resources necessary for a well-balanced farm business.

Disaster loans made pursuant to Public Law 38 are restricted to those areas desig-

nated by the Secretary because of a production disaster which has caused a widespread need among farmers of the area for credit, not otherwise available, to continue their operations. The purpose of this program is to provide a temporary source of credit to help farmers who have suffered production losses to recover from such losses sufficiently to return to their normal sources of credit. These loans are made where farmers have sustained production losses and are not available under the act to farmers whose need for Government credit arises because of an economic condition.

Question 6: "If not, would you favor special legislation to provide emergency loans to help cattlemen carry their herds during the present period?"

No special legislation is needed with respect to the types of credit loans the Department now is authorized to make.

To the extent that cattlemen who need Government loans to continue in operation also have suffered losses of production in feed crops, pastures, ranges, etc., the present facilities of the Farmers Home Administration are adequate.

The Farm Credit Administration does not need any special legislation to enable it to continue to serve farmers who have a sound basis for credit.

SECRETARY BENSON STRESSES ORDERLY CATTLE MARKETING AND DEVELOPMENT OF CONSUMER DEMAND

Calling upon producers to follow an orderly pattern of marketing, and processing and distribution agencies to develop a consumer demand for beef, Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson today sounded a note of optimism to reassure cattle people disturbed by the decline of fed cattle prices at central markets.

"The United States economy is fundamentally strong," the Secretary pointed out. "Employment and incomes are higher than ever before. This promises more stability in cattle prices, particularly since reductions due this year in the supply of pork will bolster the market for cattle."

"As the Department repeatedly has called to the attention of producers, the rapid buildup in cattle numbers has pointed to a somewhat lower level of prices than in 1951 or 1952. Recent breaks appear to be an unorderly and temporary overadjustment to what should be a natural reaction to this increase in cattle numbers. We feel that a return to orderly marketing will check the price slide."

The Secretary pointed out that prices of fed cattle in central markets have declined sharply in recent weeks. In late January, average prices of Choice slaughter steers at Chicago were down \$7 per 100 pounds from late November. Good steers had dropped \$6 in the same period. On 1,000-pound steers these declines amount to \$60 and \$70 per head.

Moreover, the markets have been unsettled, showing much day-to-day change and a wide range of prices paid for cattle nearly alike in quality. Last week individual sales of choice grade steers at Chicago varied from \$22.50 to \$31.50 per 100 pounds. A year earlier the range had been less than half as wide.

The market for cattle has been under pressure since early fall as receipts have increased. Cattle production in the United States was expanded rapidly during the past 4 years in response to the strong demand for beef. Numbers on farms were built up from 77,000,000 in January 1949, to 88,000,000 in January 1952, and a further rise during 1952 was indicated. Although total numbers for January 1953 will not be known until February 13, the number in feedlots has been reported at a new high, up 16 percent from January 1952.

With dry weather in many areas an added stimulus, marketings of range cattle began to increase last fall, and severe price declines

resulted for this kind of cattle. Now many of those cattle that went into feedlots are moving to slaughter.

As supply conditions have changed over the past year, the tenor of the market has shifted abruptly from the inflationary spirit of a year or two ago to a depressed condition now. Uncertainty on the part of both buyers and sellers has contributed to an unwarranted pessimism. Disturbed by the price trends, many feeders have let their cattle go at half finish. At three Midwest markets in January, more than twice as many fed steers of Commercial grade were received than a year ago, and receipts of Good grade were 60 percent larger. Numbers of Choice and Prime grade were down 26 percent. Meanwhile, consumer demand for the bigger supply of beef, especially of the medium quality, has not yet been fully expressed.

"Complaints have been received," the Secretary pointed out in closing, "that the compulsory grading required by OPS and the retention of price ceilings on beef have contributed to price declines. I have publicly announced my recommendation that these requirements be ended. Leaders in the industry agree that the removal of controls would in itself tend to strengthen cattle prices and stabilize markets."

[From the Washington Post of February 27, 1953]

SOUTH KOREA TO ASK U. N. HELP IN FOOD CRISIS

SEOUL, February 27.—The food crisis in the Army of the Republic of Korea has grown so grave that Gen. Paik Sun Yup, its chief of staff, yesterday said he would ask the United Nations for help. He did not go into detail.

It is a paradox that the South Korean Army is gaining strength in numbers and losing strength at the "chow" line. Defense Minister Shin Tae Yong yesterday said at Pusan that in the miserable food situation the South Korean soldier gets only a third of the calories he needs.

This has sent several thousand Korean draftees to hospitals with tuberculosis, malnutrition, and other dietary diseases. Medical sources would not reveal the figure, but Korean Army officers said 7,000 men—the equivalent of 2 Korean regiments—had been affected.

Communist propaganda has made much of the situation. Peiping broadcasts assert the number of desertions increases daily.

Lt. Col. Kim Dong Ik, commanding officer of the Korean 36th Army Hospital, said the average Korean soldier gets about 2,900 calories a day, although he needs about 4,000 as a minimum.

This does not include the 2,500 Koreans with each United States division, who get the same number of calories as Americans. Independent Korean divisions, however, have been fed by the Korean Government.

Shin said the South Korean Government, deep in its third hard year of war and short of money and resources, is helpless to solve the food situation.

The Korean Military Advisory Group, whose aim is to help the Koreans, says it is doing what it can.

INTEREST ON THE PUBLIC DEBT

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, only a few months ago the American people were reminded that they "never had it so good before." Of course, that statement has many implications, and many interpretations may be placed upon it.

In this morning's issue of the Washington Times-Herald appears an article under the heading "Debt Interest in 25 Years Cost United States \$60 Billion."

In the fiscal year 1933, which was about the time when the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt took over control of the Federal Government, the total expenditures of the Federal Government for a 12 months' period amounted to \$4,622,865,028. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks the article to which I have referred, written by Walter Trohan, and published in this morning's issue of the Washington Times-Herald. The article lists, for a 25-year period from 1929, including 8 months of 1953, the annual interest payments on the Federal debt.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEBT INTEREST IN 25 YEARS COST UNITED STATES \$60 BILLION—BUDGET BALANCED ONLY 5 TIMES IN PERIOD

(By Walter Trohan)

Interest on the public debt has cost the American people more than \$60 billion in the last 25 years.

A study of Treasury interest payments from July 1, 1928, into 1953 discloses that interest payments on the debt mounted to a total cost of \$60,690,411,000.

Federal borrowing was condemned by Thomas Jefferson. In a letter to Eldridge Gerry, Jefferson said:

"I sincerely believe with you that the principle of spending money to be paid by posterity, under the name of funding, is but swindling futurity on a large-scale basis."

FIVE BALANCED BUDGETS

In only 5 of the 25 fiscal years studied was the budget balanced and a surplus accumulated. Four of these years were under Republican rule or a Republican Congress. The years were 1929, 1930, 1947, 1948, and 1950.

Since the end of World War II the interest on the public debt has passed the \$4 billion mark. It is now approaching \$6 billion a year.

The interest on the public debt is now costing taxpayers more than it cost to run the Government in any year, except for the expenditures of World War I, through the fiscal year which ended June 30, 1933. In that fiscal year, which marked the first months of the New Deal, the total cost of running the Federal Government was \$4,611,000,000.

TABLE OF PAYMENTS

Annual reports of the Secretary of the Treasury for the fiscal years from 1929 through February 27, 1953, indicated interest payments as follows:

1929	\$678,330,000
1930	659,347,000
1931	611,559,000
1932	599,276,000
1933	689,356,000
1934	759,600,000
1935	913,100,000
1936	867,400,000
1937	866,384,000
1938	926,200,000
1939	941,000,000
1940	1,041,000,000
1941	1,110,200,000
1942	1,260,000,000
1943	1,813,000,000
1944	2,610,000,000
1945	3,621,000,000
1946	4,747,500,000
1947	4,958,000,000
1948	5,187,800,000
1949	5,352,300,000
1950	5,496,300,000
1951	5,615,100,000
1952	5,853,000,000
1953 (8 months)	3,512,150,000
Total	60,690,411,000

This compilation does not include \$1 billion interest paid on Government guaranteed obligations for the years from 1936 through 1952.

SOUNDED OTHER WARNINGS

Jefferson sounded other warnings against Federal borrowing. In 1791 he wrote James Monroe, saying:

"We are ruined if we do not overrule the principle that the more we owe the more prosperous we shall be; that a public debt furnishes the means of enterprise; that if ours be once paid off, we should incur another by any means, however extravagant."

In 1802, as President, he wrote:

"If we can prevent the Government from wasting the labors of the people under pretense of taking care of them, they must become happy."

Mr. DWORSHAK. I should like to stress the point that in the fiscal year 1952, it required \$5,853,000,000 to pay the interest on the Federal debt, which sum is more than \$1 billion in excess of the total expenditures of the Federal Government in the fiscal year 1933.

AUTHORIZATION TO COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS TO REPORT NOMINATIONS

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, on behalf of the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee [Mr. WILEY], I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to report nominations for the executive calendar, following the close of business today, up to 12 o'clock midnight of Tuesday March 10.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ARE THE CHURCHES FAILING OUR GIs?

Mr. GRISWOLD. Mr. President, this morning I should like to call attention to a magazine article in which some of our top military spiritual leaders indicate that at least a part of our churches are failing to play their full role in our mobilization program.

The article, to which I refer, is entitled "Are the Churches Failing Our GIs?" and it appears on newsstands today in the March issue of the American Mercury magazine.

It is not my intention to take personal issue with any creed or denomination, but as chairman of the Veterans Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I am particularly interested in this subject. Particularly am I concerned with this report because of the possible effects which inadequate spiritual guidance for our GIs may have on the domestic life of our Nation in future years.

This article, written by Scott Hershey and Harry Tennant, states that Rear Adm. S. W. Salisbury, Chief of Naval Chaplains, retired last month so that he could devote his full time to contacting church leaders. He is sufficiently concerned with the gravity of the situation that he is now trying to develop a program which will make the Nation's churches more effective in preparing our young men and women for their period of military service and to administer to their moral stability while on military duty.

To me the seriousness of this matter is revealed in a statement by the Chairman of the Armed Forces Chaplains Board, Maj. Gen. Charles Carpenter. This Defense Department spiritual leader said that the general assembly of the National Council of Churches recently gave only 25 minutes out of a 3-day conference to a discussion of the spiritual problems of men and women in the services.

Admiral Salisbury deplors the attitude of many churchmen, some educators, and various groups of pacifists who put forth the idea that a tour of duty with the military is something to be stoically endured, and that it is simply 2 years out of the life of a young man.

It happens that I am a Presbyterian by faith. I am, therefore particularly concerned that this article points out that, with some exceptions, the Protestants have fallen down on the job. They have failed to indoctrinate their young men on the spiritual problems and responsibilities they will face upon entering the service. They have failed to maintain adequate contact with their members after they have been called to duty. They have sometimes ignored the needs of spiritual and social requirements of their members stationed in nearby military installations. I am told that many denominations have refused to make their best young ministers available for chaplain duty in the Armed Forces.

Perhaps my colleagues may view with alarm this situation, as I do. I am in accord with the view our military spiritual leaders recently took of a Kremlin pronouncement that the danger in Russia today was the association of Russian young people with the church and that the Soviets were taking steps to see that such association ended. General Carpenter has bluntly warned the heads of United States churches that failure to recognize their responsibility to the youth now in service could produce the same result but without the same statement of purpose.

I hope all Members of the Senate will agree with me as to the importance of this subject. Because of its pertinence I ask unanimous consent that the article be incorporated in the body of the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ARE THE CHURCHES FAILING OUR GIs?

(By Scott Hershey and Harry Tennant)

Each year for the next few years—and as far ahead as we can see—more than a million young men and women will be uprooted from their homes and their communities and drafted or enlisted into the Armed Forces. Another million annually will be mustered back into civilian life as service alumni.

A generation from now these young men and young women will be expected to provide the political, the social, and the economic leadership of the Nation. And the manner in which they fulfill these expectations will depend to a large degree on the imprints left upon their characters by their tenure of service in the Armed Forces.

This very obvious fact is the source of increasing alarm among the chaplains in all echelons of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force. They believe that the most important factor in building the character of

young men and women—their spiritual life and guidance—is being badly neglected as far as those in the Armed Forces are concerned.

A study of the situation reveals that the Armed Forces themselves, the Congress, and the public must all share some of the blame. But, in the opinion of the chief chaplains of the services, the major responsibility—and the major failure—is that of the churches themselves.

The grave apprehension of the service chaplains is illustrated by the retirement last month of the Chief Chaplain of the United States Navy, Rear Adm. S. W. Salisbury, a vigorous, active, outspoken man. He announced his retirement at the age of 62, so that he can devote his full time to maintaining contacts with church leaders and seminarians throughout the Nation, acquainting them with the seriousness of the situation, and urging them and their churches to develop positive, detailed programs to meet their challenge.

"We are a military state, whether we like it or not—and most of us do not," he said. "Nevertheless, the fact that we have been forced into a military state in time of peace—or semipeace—demands that our churches develop new techniques and new programs, if they are to fulfill their spiritual responsibilities to our young GI men and women."

The Chief Chaplains of the Army and the Air Force, Major Generals Ivan Loveridge Bennett and Charles I. Carpenter, are in full agreement with Admiral Salisbury regarding the gravity of the challenge. And with varying degrees of emphasis they concur in Admiral Salisbury's opinion, that, while most of the churches did an excellent job of meeting the spiritual problems of the GI during the two world wars, they have failed sadly to meet the entirely different, and unprecedented, problem resulting from the mobilization of 3,500,000 men and women in the Armed Forces in time of troubled peace.

The Armed Forces Chaplains Board, of which these three clergymen are members, was created by the Secretary of Defense to advise him on spiritual and moral problems in the services. It is composed of the three Chiefs of Chaplains, Army, Navy, and Air Force, and one additional representative from each service. Its purpose is to make possible a unified approach to the moral and spiritual and other related problems within the services.

"Many denominations have failed miserably to keep pace with the current needs of youth in the service," General Carpenter, who is chairman of the Armed Forces Chaplains Board, declared. "Their apathetic attitude is illustrated by a recent meeting of the General Assembly of the National Council of Churches, at which I spoke on behalf of the service chaplains."

"Only 25 minutes, of a 3-day conference, was devoted to the discussion of the spiritual problems of the men and women of the Army, Navy, and Air Force."

Admiral Salisbury, who addressed the conference in 1951, noted that "It was not until 2 years ago that the conference even acknowledged that the problem existed."

Curiously enough the three chief chaplains, General Carpenter a Methodist, General Bennett a Southern Baptist, and Admiral Salisbury a Presbyterian, agree that the problem is predominantly a Protestant one. They feel that the Catholic Church and the Jewish faiths are fully aware of the needs of their youth in the service, and have taken adequate steps to meet them.

"The Catholic Church, by its very nature, leaves it up to the individual to maintain contact with the Church—whether in or out of the service," Admiral Salisbury said. "Members of the Jewish faith, individualistic in nature, are drawn together by the tenets of their religion. Consequently, these two faiths are not beset by the same problems which plague the Protestant churches."

Chaplains in all branches of the service report they receive excellent cooperation from the National Catholic Welfare Conference and the Jewish Welfare Board.

Many Catholic high schools and universities have established excellent preinduction courses for their students. In these courses, the prospective recruit is advised that military service is a part of life, not a detached period in which the moral standards he adheres to at home can be temporarily suspended. He is counseled to prepare himself mentally, physically, and spiritually for his new experience. He is informed of the various programs in the Armed Forces in which he can participate to the advantage of his chosen career. He is given lectures, illustrated by motion pictures, to guide him in such problems as marriage and his relations with men and women of other races, creeds, and nationalities, of other habits and customs.

Similar programs have been adopted by a few nonsectarian schools, Protestant churches, and isolated communities. But they are all too few.

With a few notable exceptions the Protestant sects have fallen down on the job. They have failed to indoctrinate their young men on the spiritual problems and responsibilities they will face on entering the service. They have failed to maintain contact with their members after they have been called to duty. They have ignored the spiritual and social requirements of members of their faiths stationed in nearby Army, Navy, and Air Force installations.

And probably most important of all, many denominations have refused to make their best young ministers available for chaplain duty. Some faiths have even failed to provide enough ministers to fill the modest quotas of chaplains assigned to them, quotas which are based on the number of men and women of their faith in the services.

"Many of the churches are saying that they cannot give us their best men," said General Carpenter. "Most of them are saying that they can't give us more men because the demand for them in civilian life is too great. Church leaders are giving us all kinds of alibis to evade their obligation of providing an adequate number of competent young ministers for chaplain duty."

One of the paradoxes of the problem is that, while the churches are actively fighting communism and are a bulwark against this threat to our liberty and freedom, they are overlooking an opportunity to engage this godless enemy directly by ministering to the spiritual needs of their young men and women on military duty.

"All churches deplore the inroads of communism," General Carpenter said, "yet many of them are shortsighted, failing to realize that, while we are actively fighting communism overseas, they are indifferent to the influence of godlessness at home."

"We have reached the place, as we approach this entire new concept of militarism in American life, where it isn't enough to sit down and argue about peace and war and what Christ said about military service."

"That isn't our problem. Our problem is, What are we going to do with the kids who are on duty in the service of the kingdom of God today?"

Admiral Salisbury deplored the attitude of many churchmen and educators who put forward the idea that a tour of military duty is something to be stoically endured; that it is simply 2 years out of the life of the young men.

"Nonsense," said Admiral Salisbury. "It is a time of growth and development; during which they need proper guidance. These young men can't develop if they have the attitude that they can drop the church for 2 years and then go back again when they return home; that they can ignore their moral training until their tour of duty is over; or that after a spiritual vacation they will suddenly become men of character in

their own communities, when their military service is ended."

The military spiritual heads were reluctant to discuss recent disclosures of widespread desertions. However, one chaplain remarked that the record showed that many deserters were unable to adjust themselves to a new mode of life, because of a lack of spiritual and moral discipline at home.

For example, General Carpenter said that, at one Air Force indoctrination center, a recent check showed the startling fact that religious illiteracy of young men entering the center ranged between 15 and 28 percent. He explained that these young men had no background of religious training or spiritual guidance to the extent that it had impressed itself upon their characters.

He feels that it is just as important for the churches to develop programs to reach these young men as it is to maintain their contacts with those who are being separated from their regular church for the first time in their lives.

The Chief Chaplain found considerable irony in a recent statement issued by the Kremlin, expressing alarm at the drift of Russian young people toward the church. Steps would be taken, the Soviet leaders warned ominously, to end this dangerous trend.

"We have warned the heads of United States churches," General Carpenter said, "that continued neglect of their responsibility to the youth now in service is producing the same results that the Kremlin seeks, but without such a frank statement of purpose."

"The future of the churches of America is being sabotaged by their own apparent unwillingness to meet the spiritual needs of the men and women who are wearing their country's uniform today."

The chaplains of all ranks and all denominations point out that the problem the Nation faces on the spiritual front today is far different from that in World War II, when a total of 22 million young men and women served varying periods in the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, and Merchant Marine.

"The very existence of war provided a certain spiritual exultation to many young men and women," one young chaplain remarked. "Then, too, the issues were brought into sharper focus, the need for great personal sacrifice more clearly defined. More important, we were a Nation united in a single, recognizable purpose, and nearly everybody played his part—the churches, the communities and the individuals."

"The problems of the peacetime army are far different. There is little if any spiritual uplift felt by the young men and women who are drafted, or reluctantly enlisted into the Armed Forces. Many of them find military life, at its best, an irksome duty; at its worst, an intolerable existence. The issues at stake are no longer so clearly defined. And, most unfortunate, there is division among their elders as to the purpose and need of the sacrifices they are making. Their need for spiritual direction and strength is even greater than the needs of elder brothers and sisters a few years ago, or their fathers during World War I."

Yet it is this greater need that is being so sorely neglected by church and community—both of which responded so splendidly to the lesser challenges of two World Wars—in the opinions of the chaplains. Within a few years more than 10 million young men and women will have spent an average of 2 years in service, and spiritual isolation. When they return to civilian life, as Admiral Sallsbury pointed out, "they will bring back with them the imprint of their service life, their observations, and their experiences in countries in which they have served."

General Bennett, who has served 31 years in the Army, and recently completed a 3-year tour of duty as Command Chaplain, Far East Command, put it this way:

"We cannot afford to neglect the problems resulting from the large increase of our military establishment—a situation that has no foreseeable end. It is almost trite, but obviously true, to say that the life of the church of tomorrow depends on the men in the service today."

The same thought was expressed in different words by Capt. E. L. Ackiss, Chief Chaplain, United States Navy, retired:

"Strong measures by your theological seminaries, our churches, and our synagogues, and by our religious communities to meet this continuing emergency in the lives of our young people, are an absolute necessity for the survival both of our religion and of our Nation."

A few of the Protestant sects are taking steps in the right direction. The chief chaplains agree that the Armed Forces Commission of the Lutheran Church, Missouri Synod, is doing an outstanding job. The Southern Baptists recently embarked on a comprehensive program to keep in touch with their young men and women in the Armed Forces. The Presbyterian Church has started a similar program, but on only a limited and experimental basis. The American Bible Society was praised for providing a million and a quarter Bibles to troops in Korea. All these programs are excellent, the chaplains say, but they are too limited in scope, and too few in number.

One particularly vexing problem in maintaining the morale—and the morals—of large Armed Forces in peacetime is that of providing proper recreational facilities and social activities, particularly to troops away from their posts. Military authorities have little trouble with the GI as long as he is within the confines of the military establishment. There, recreational and social opportunities are provided.

Obviously, however, there is a limit to the time that American young men and women outside the combat areas can be restricted to the limits of their military posts, without a serious loss of morale. It is when the young GI, man or woman, is "out on the town" that trouble is usually encouraged.

And here again, the chaplains believe, the churches must accept a full share of the responsibility. For a substantial proportion of the trouble that members of our Armed Forces get into would be avoided if the churches in the communities near military posts would develop recreational and social programs for the service people of their faith.

"The opportunity for young servicemen to join in church-sponsored recreational groups is an integral part of their spiritual training," General Carpenter said. "This is particularly true of Protestant youth which has always looked to the church to provide social activities."

"But in community after community the local churches have ignored the recreational needs of the men and women stationed at nearby military and naval installations."

As a result of this dereliction, hundreds of thousands of unsophisticated young service men and women who might otherwise be attending church socials, are drawn into cheap dance halls, disreputable night clubs, clip joints, and sordid dives. They are subjected to temptations that either did not exist in their own communities, or, if they did exist, they were able to resist because of the strength of their ties with home and church. Deprived of that strength, they often fall easy victims to the hordes of chisellers, sharpers, professional gamblers, and prostitutes who prey on lonely, restless servicemen. The results are frequently a serious undermining of the victim's moral fiber; sometimes sudden tragedy, imprisonment, and even violent death.

Many churches feel they have discharged their obligation to service people when they announce, through the chaplain, the time

and place of their services and social functions.

In this attitude the chaplains feel that the church is simply following the pattern of so many communities which regard the serviceman as merely a source of revenue; not as a fellow Christian to be accepted and welcomed into the community's social life. There are relatively few churches, the chaplains say, which have gone directly to the servicemen of their faith, at nearby installations, and invited them to become a part of their congregation, and participate fully in all its activities.

There are some exceptions. Admiral Sallsbury noted that pitifully few churches in Washington, D. C., conduct sightseeing tours of the Nation's Capital for servicemen, ending with church or young people's devotions. He mentioned Jacksonville, Fla., as a community which has projects for servicemen and provides them with maps of various churches and other points of interest in the city. The San Diego City Federation of Churches has a friends-finder service, which takes servicemen into church homes in the area and arranges for them to attend services in the local churches with these families.

At the top of the list of communities which have recognized the problem and in which the churches and local businessmen have united to meet it, is Belleville, Ill. Admiral Sallsbury said this community, which had one of the worst records about a year ago, is now almost a model of what can be done to provide spiritual and recreational guidance for the servicemen stationed near there.

The Department of Defense feels it has discharged its obligations in the spiritual field by the support it gives through the Corps of Chaplains. The assistance given, however, is in some cases limited. For example, the Navy chaplains last year requested a \$900,000 appropriation for their work. By the time the Defense Department, the Bureau of the Budget, and the Congress got through with this request it was slashed to less than one-third that amount. There are about 900 Navy chaplains. The funds made available amounted to about \$300 per chaplain and this broken down further shows the ridiculously low figure of between 35 and 40 cents per man per year.

The Navy chaplain's office submitted a budget request for \$1,026,000 in the current budget now before the Congress. By the time this request went through the Pentagon and the Bureau of the Budget the amount was reduced to \$300,000. This amounts to about \$333.33 per chaplain, which is an increase of \$33.33 per chaplain over the previous year—if the Congress does not further reduce it. Compare this with the \$46 billion requested in the new budget for the armed services.

In the matter of the construction of chapels, a benevolent Government is equally remiss. For example: In the Navy the construction of chapels is under the Bureau of Yards and Docks shore development program. Navy chaplains, who serve the Marine Corps, have been trying since 1940 to obtain funds for a suitable and adequate chapel at Quantico Marine Base. Recently the Chief of Chaplains of the Navy was advised that construction of a chapel had finally made the shore development list. He was exuberant. His exuberance chilled somewhat when he was further advised that the chapel was 33d on the list. Thirty-third turned out to be last on the list. What was the 32d project on the list? Construction of stables.

While all three services could use more chaplains, the Navy seems to have less difficulty filling its quota than do the Army and the Air Force. General Bennett said that the Army is presently short about 200 chaplains. The Air Force is having difficulty in filling its quota. The Navy is on the alert for chaplains, but primarily to meet replacement needs.

Admiral Sallsbury has pointed out that, while the chaplaincy in the past has been an

emergency service, "from here on out for our generation, the military chaplaincy will rank in the church as a regular form of Christian service for ordained ministers of the Gospel."

"It has become a calling as valid and as important as the foreign missionary, or the home pastorate," Admiral Salisbury said. "It represents a great opportunity and challenge and, by the strong support of her chaplains, the church is ultimately contributing to the enriching and strengthening of her own life."

At a recent Pentagon conference for religious leaders, delegates were told by a Chaplains Corps spokesman that "there isn't a church represented here today that isn't throwing into the mission fields of the world everything it can throw. In many instances you are having to overcome the greatest obstacles to bring the gospel into the hearts of men. Here stands an agency of Government—the Corps of Chaplains—which opens its arms and says please come and hear our words, and the ear of the church is turned against it and the leadership that is needed of the church is absolutely neglected."

Refuting the alibis of many churches for their failure to provide qualified chaplains, military leaders believe, is the current emphasis given by many denominations to placing student pastors in institutions of higher learning. Military men contend that the armed services today have become the greatest educational institution in the country. Yet one denomination had less than 200 chaplains with the military services, and more than 400 student pastors in colleges and universities.

In one branch of the service, strength is about twice what it was a year ago. In order to obtain chaplains, this branch called every reserve chaplain 48 years of age and under, in the grade of major and below. An official charged with this task said, "It was like pulling teeth to get some of the men who held definite reserve commissions." The chief difficulty was not the refusal of the chaplain himself, but that of religious leaders, church officials, and even politicians who wrote letters insisting that these men be deferred to serve in their home communities.

In discussing the church's relationship with the Army, General Bennett explained: "Of course the local communities cannot be drained of spiritual leadership by the services, without a resulting deterioration of morals and moral standards among the civilian population."

"It is necessary to maintain a balance between the men and women on the home front and those in the armed services. It takes all these men and women to make up the Nation and we must keep in mind the welfare of the country as a whole."

Under present procedure the services ask the various churches to provide chaplains, according to the number of men and women under arms. The quotas are allotted among Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish religions on the basis of the number of men of each faith in the services. In addition to certain physical and mental requirements, the chaplains must meet other standards necessitated by the unusual aspects of their missions in the Armed Forces.

General Bennett pointed out that about 70 percent of the men studying for the ministry or the priesthood today are former servicemen. A large percentage of the chaplains who served in World War II were Reserve officers. Many of these have returned to active-duty status, but many more are unavailable because of age and grade limitations.

The Chaplains Corps does not have the responsibility of providing chaplains. The churches do have this responsibility.

"The churches must face the fact that this mission field is the place in which they need to place men," said General Carpenter, "not because someone wants volumes and numbers but because the souls of men depend upon whether there are enough chaplains to provide adequate spiritual care."

Not too long ago the very existence of the Corps of Chaplains was threatened by persistent attacks from many churches. In the early thirties, when a wave of pacifism was at its height, a leading nondenominational religious weekly advocated discontinuance of ecclesiastical endorsement of chaplains by the general commission or any of its affiliated denominations. Many denominational publications joined in the attack. One group, the Disciples of Christ, voted to send no more chaplains to the Armed Forces, and requested the general commission to sever its connection with the military chaplaincy. In 1934 several Methodist conferences requested their bishops to refrain from sending any of their members to the chaplaincy. In 1936 the Evangelical and Reformed Church refused further participation. The Methodist Episcopal Church requested the federal council to seek a method whereby civilian ministers might render the spiritual ministry to the Armed Forces.

The efforts resulted in an attitude survey by the federal council of the Armed Forces chaplains. They found a strong sense of vocation among the chaplains and learned that uniform and rank were both important factors in their work.

In due time, the tide of pacifism ebbed with the coming of the shadows of World War II, and the prestige of the chaplain rose again in ecclesiastical circles.

Now, the chaplaincy has the finest opportunities for service; the highest standing in the military scheme; and the best possible equipment for professional performance. But many chaplains fear that some of the churches are showing signs of reverting again to the attitude they held toward the Corps of Chaplains back in the 1930's.

Important as the chaplaincy is, however, the chief chaplains agree that without the full support and cooperation of the churches they cannot perform their missions. Admiral Salisbury emphasizes that the churches must bring their influence to bear on their young men and women before they go into the service, while they are in, and when they get home again.

General Carpenter has suggested that, when an inductee leaves to go into the service, some agency of his church should be informed by his pastor. This agency of the church should be responsible for maintaining contact with the GI throughout his entire period in service. General Carpenter further suggested that the churches name a contact pastor from a church of the same denomination located near the Military Establishment where the man is stationed. The contact pastor could then go into the Military Establishment and get acquainted with the youth and take him into the life of the church and the community. There the church could substitute its influence for that of the church at home.

The chaplains agree that the home churches of the men in service, as well as their family and friends, should keep in communication with their servicemen while away. Admiral Salisbury said this touch with home, with associates, and with loved ones, keeps the serviceman conscious of all those good and fine things which make him a man of character and responsibility.

Admiral Salisbury told the second annual governor's conference on children and youth, at Providence, R. I., last fall, that, while it is the responsibility of the military to keep alive those vital connections with the home people, "it is the responsibility of the home folks, in the schools, churches, homes, and communities, to keep in touch with their service people."

"For within a decade, military service of your young people will reach with strong influence into every institution of our national life. You must have men and women of character in your local communities in the days to come. We all need them if our Nation is to survive."

CALL OF THE CALENDAR

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, if the morning hour has been concluded, I ask unanimous consent that the calendar be called, beginning with Order No. 48.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The Clerk will proceed to call the bills on the calendar beginning with No. 48.

ERICH ANTON HELFERT

The bill (S. 56) for the relief of Erich Anton Helfert was announced as first in order.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I serve as a member of the so-called minority Calendar Committee. I did not hear the announcement of the order number now under consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate is about to consider Order No. 48, S. 56, a bill for the relief of Erich Anton Helfert.

Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GORE. Is the Senate now considering Calendar Nos. 19 and 21? Have they been called?

The VICE PRESIDENT. They are not included in the list of orders to be considered on the call of the calendar, at this time. Calendar No. 48 is the first order to be called. Is there objection to the present consideration of Calendar No. 48?

There being no objection, the bill (S. 56) for the relief of Erich Anton Helfert, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Erich Anton Helfert shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

FELIX KORTSCHAK

The bill (S. 59) for the relief of Felix Kortschak was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Felix Kortschak shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

Mr. GORE subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the votes by which Calendar Nos. 48 and 49, being, respectively, Senate bill 56, for the relief of Erich Anton Helfert, and Senate bill 59, for the relief of Felix Kortschak, were passed, be reconsidered,

and that the bills be passed over without prejudice.

In support of that request I should like to state that since the passage of these bills I have conferred with the junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], who has taken a leading part, as Senators are aware, in the entire program of student exchange. He says that he does not believe these bills should pass, that their passage would tend to defeat the purpose of the student exchange program, and would set precedents which would encourage more legislation of this type. Therefore I submit the unanimous-consent request.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have not followed the Senator from Tennessee. Will he tell me what bills he is referring to?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Tennessee asks unanimous consent that the votes by which Calendar Nos. 48 and 49, being, respectively, Senate bills 56 and 59, were passed, be reconsidered, and that the bills be passed over, on the grounds which he has stated.

Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Tennessee? The Chair hears none; and the votes by which Senate bill 56 and Senate bill 59 were passed are reconsidered, and the bills are passed over.

JOSEPH FLURY PALUY

The bill (S. 65) for the relief of Joseph Flury Paluy was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Joseph Flury Paluy may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act.

DETROIT AUTOMOTIVE PRODUCTS CO.

The bill (S. 100) for the relief of the Detroit Automotive Products Co., was announced as next in order.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, this bill provides that the petition of the Detroit Automotive Products Co. for relief under section 722 of the Internal Revenue Code shall be held and considered to have been received by the Tax Court of the United States within the time allowed by law and regulations for the filing of such a petition.

In this case the taxpayer's application for administrative relief under section 722 was disallowed by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, and notice of such disallowance was mailed to taxpayer on April 4, 1951. The taxpayer then had 90 days, or until July 3, 1951, to file a petition with the Tax Court; such a petition was executed by the taxpayer and mailed by its counsel from Detroit, Mich., to the Tax Court in Washington, D. C., on June 26, 1951, in ample time to arrive at the Tax Court prior to the statutory deadline, but the Tax Court records indicate that the petition was not received at the Tax Court until July 5, 1951, 2

days after the expiration of the statutory 90-day period. Because of this, the Tax Court declined to entertain jurisdiction of the petition.

Considering the undisputed facts in this case which completely negate any negligence on the part of the taxpayer in attempting to file a timely petition with the Tax Court, the committee is moved to permit this taxpayer his day in court, and it is therefore recommended that the bill be considered favorably.

The Department of the Treasury has recommended against enactment of this bill.

The committee went into the subject very carefully. The enactment of the bill would give the Bureau of Internal Revenue an opportunity to consider this case. Therefore the committee unanimously reported the bill to the Senate.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. It gives the Tax Court permission to do what?

Mr. LANGER. The court would have an opportunity to consider the petition, in the same manner in which any other petition for a rebate may be considered.

Mr. MORSE. What it amounts to, then, is a waiver of the time element, but it does not go to the merits of whether the company is entitled to the refund.

Mr. LANGER. That is correct.

Mr. MORSE. Therefore the bill is a procedural bill with regard to the time element, which so operated in this case that the company was not entitled to consideration of the merits of its request for a refund because of the procedural factor involved in the time element. Is that correct?

Mr. LANGER. That is correct.

Mr. MORSE. Is the Senator from Oregon to understand that the bill is so worded that its passage in no way whatever indicates to the Tax Court that the Senate, and, if approved by the House, the Congress, feels that the tax refund on the merits should be granted?

Mr. LANGER. That is correct. It is merely a waiver.

Mr. MORSE. With that legislative history established, I have no objection.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from North Dakota has very ably and correctly stated the substance of the bill. I believe the procedural difficulty came about because a holiday intervened—as I recall, it was the Fourth of July—and the mail to the Tax Court was not picked up or, if it was picked up, it was not opened and considered.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, the staff of the committee which has prepared the memorandum I hold in my hand points out that it has been fairly clearly established that the appeal was mailed on June 26.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. GORE. It is marked as not having been received until July 5.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. GORE. To me, that clearly confirms the position of the Senator from Michigan, and certainly I have no objection to passage of the bill.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I should like to say that there is ample

precedent for the procedure here proposed, and a similar bill was passed by the Senate last year.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 100) was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the petition of the Detroit Automotive Products Co. for relief under section 722 of the Internal Revenue Code shall be held and considered to have been received by the Tax Court of the United States within the time allowed by law and regulations for the filing of such a petition.

FRED P. HINES—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 152) for the relief of Fred P. Hines was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, let me observe that this bill differs from the bill which has just been passed, for this bill does not waive the statute of limitations, but, instead, confers a gratuity upon an American citizen, even though the Judiciary Committee says it recognizes that the claimant has no legal ground for recovering. The citizen also draws a pension of \$90 a month for non-service-incurred disability.

Unless there is some merit which does not appear in the committee report, I shall be compelled to object to this bill as establishing a dangerous precedent for the Senate.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, the circumstances in this case are very unusual. Mr. Hines is over 80 years of age. He was treated at a veterans' hospital for various ailments. Some years later he returned to the hospital and was again treated. Some 4 or 5 years passed, and again he went to the veterans' hospital; and the physicians there said to him: "Go home and die; you have cancer." So they sent him home, within 24 hours.

Later he went to a private hospital, where he was treated and put in condition for an operation. It took about a month to build him up by proper nourishment to enable him to withstand an operation. He was operated on, has been living ever since, and is still alive. Yet the veterans' hospital doctors said he would die within 24 hours. I can state the exact dates, if the Senator from Tennessee is interested in having that done. It was in 1931, more than 20 years ago, that he was told to go home and die.

This bill provides for the payment of his hospital expenses, which amounted to \$778.78. The veterans' hospital absolutely refused to take care of him, as I have stated, and I repeat that he was sent home to die.

Certainly the Judiciary Committee went over this bill very carefully. A similar bill was passed by the Senate a year ago, and was then passed by the House, but was vetoed by President Truman. The veto was overridden by the Senate, but there was insufficient time to have the veto overridden by the House of Representatives.

The Judiciary Committee feels that this bill is a very meritorious one. It will take care of an old, destitute veteran. He is receiving a small pension, but it is very small indeed; and of course he is worried about his hospital debt, which I understand is almost all still owed by him.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, undoubtedly this case merits sympathy; but the facts are plain, namely, that the citizen does not have a service-connected disability. Despite that fact, he has received numerous treatments in veterans' hospitals, without charge to him.

It may well be that a medical mistake was made in this case, one which was corrected by a private hospital. However, that set of circumstances would not appear to me to justify a recovery by this gentleman. Indeed, the committee itself says so.

I should like to have an opportunity to go into this matter somewhat further, before objecting to the bill, provided the bill can go over without objection at this time.

So, Mr. President, I ask that the bill now go over.

Mr. LANGER. Does the Senator from Tennessee request that the bill go over, to be placed at the foot of the calendar?

Mr. GORE. Yes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the bill will be passed over to the foot of the calendar.

MARY BOUESSA DEEB

The bill (S. 248) for the relief of Mary Bouessa Deeb was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mary Bouessa Deeb shall be deemed to have been born in Canada.

ALAMBERT E. ROBINSON

The bill (S. 365) for the relief of Alambert E. Robinson was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, this bill is to waive in favor of Alambert E. Robinson, the claimant, sections 15 to 20 of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act, so that he may present his claim for adjudication.

The sections referred to bar him because of a time limitation. Mr. Robinson's eyes became infected in March of 1940, and he filed his claim.

It was determined, however, that the infection had resulted from trachoma, which had existed for a long time prior to this date, and a claim on that ground was barred.

Inasmuch as trachoma was prevalent among Indians, with whom the claimant had daily contact during his employment in the Department of the Interior, it was felt by the Department that this disease may have been contracted in the course of employment.

The committee is of the opinion that the claim should at least be passed upon;

and it is noted particularly that no benefits, if any, are to accrue for any period prior to the enactment of the bill, except for medical and hospital expenses incurred.

The committee recommends this bill to the favorable consideration of the Senate.

Mr. MORSE. The procedure in waiving the statute of limitations does not go to the merits of the claim, does it?

Mr. LANGER. Not at all.

Mr. MORSE. Then, I have no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (S. 365) for the relief of Alambert E. Robinson was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That sections 15 and 20, inclusive, of the act entitled "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes," approved September 7, 1916, as amended (5 U. S. C. 765-769), are hereby waived in favor of Alambert E. Robinson for compensation for disability resulting from loss of vision secondary to trachoma contracted prior to March 1940, allegedly by reason of his employment as an employee of the United States Indian Service at the Pima Indian Agency, Sacaton, Ariz., and his claim is authorized and directed to be considered and acted upon under the remaining provisions of such act, as amended, if he files such claim with the Bureau of Employees' Compensation not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this act. No benefits shall accrue by reason of the enactment of this act for any period prior to the date of its enactment, except in the case of such medical or hospitalization expenditures which may be deemed reimbursable.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 484) for the relief of J. Don Alexander was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, at the request of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], who are not now on the floor, I ask that the bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

ALTOON SAPRICHIAN

The bill (S. 615) for the relief of Altoon Saprichian was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Altoon Saprichian shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

EUGENE RIVOCHÉ AND MARIE BARSKY

The bill (S. 837) for the relief of Eugene Rivoche and Marie Barsky was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Eugene Rivoche and Marie Barsky shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct two numbers from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

PHED VOSNIACOS—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 101) for the relief of Phed Vosniacos was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill, please?

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, this bill grants the status of permanent residence in the United States to a 24-year-old native and citizen of Greece who last entered the United States on December 1, 1947, to attend Michigan State College. He is presently employed as a reporter for the State Journal, in Lansing, Mich. A bill similar to this passed the Senate in the 82d Congress, second session. However, it was passed too late for action by the House of Representatives prior to the adjournment of the Congress.

Is a further explanation desired?

Mr. MORSE. I wish to ask one or two questions.

Mr. LANGER. Very well.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield to me?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. GORE. It seems to me that this bill calls for the establishment of a policy on the part of the great committee of which the distinguished Senator from North Dakota is chairman. There are on the calendar today three bills which would grant permanent residence to exchange students. It is the understanding of the junior Senator from Tennessee that these students came to the United States largely, if not entirely, at the expense of the United States; and that they came here upon the statement that they would not seek citizenship or permanent residence.

It is my understanding that the purpose of the program was to educate in this country certain outstanding foreign students, who would return to their home countries, taking with them an understanding and an appreciation of the United States and its way of life. If we are to continue, as we are doing here today in three instances, to grant citizenship and permanent residence to those exchange students, in violation of their own pledge, we shall be defeating the very purpose of this program. I shall not object to these three bills today, but

hereafter, unless the Judiciary Committee establishes some policy with respect to exchange students, I shall object to the passage on the Consent Calendar of any further bills of this character.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I agree with everything said by the Senator from Tennessee, except the last two sentences. Everything he said, until he got to the last two sentences, raised the whole question of whether we are to establish here today a precedent whereby it will be possible to get around the immigration laws of the United States.

I believe my record is pretty clear as to what I think we ought to do about the immigration laws of the United States. In my opinion we ought to revise them openly and frontally, and not get around them by indirection. I have not had time to study these bills, but when this bill was called—and now the Senator from Tennessee tells me there are on the calendar two more like it—I saw at once that a very basic principle was involved, namely, whether we are to let the exchange-student program be used as a back-door entrance for citizenship in the United States, when such students would not get citizenship or permanent residence in the United States if they had followed the quota system applicable to their respective countries. I assume they would not be eligible. At least, at this time they would not be eligible, and, if not, then they ought to follow the regular course and not attempt to proceed by way of special legislation.

Therefore, Mr. President, until I have had an opportunity to study these bills and give consideration to the immigration-policy principle which I think is involved, I shall object to this bill and to all other similar bills that may be on the calendar.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. I was about to suggest that this is not the case of an exchange student. As I understand, this bill involves a scholarship bestowed by the Greek Orthodox Church, rather than an exchange procedure. He came to the United States under that scholarship, rather than under the student-exchange system. I wonder whether that would make any difference.

Mr. MORSE. I do not think that involves any matter of substance at all, but only a matter of form. It appears to me that this boy was admitted into the United States for one purpose, and that he now seeks to turn that purpose into something entirely different. I think he ought to take his chances with the consul at Istanbul. I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is heard, and the bill will be passed over.

FRANCESCO CRACCHIOLO—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 102) for the relief of Francesco Cracchiolo was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, this bill grants the status of permanent residence in the United States to a 39-year-old native and citizen of Italy, who last entered the United States as a visitor on September 5, 1950. He resides in Detroit, Mich., with his brother, who is a citizen of the United States and part owner of a restaurant. The brother of the beneficiary of the bill states that his health is poor and that his physician has advised a long period of rest. Because of these circumstances he has trained the beneficiary of the bill to take his place in the restaurant.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I want to assure my friend, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] that I shall study this bill along with the other bill, but I am going to study these bills in the light of the whole question of our immigration policy. I think we had better face the whole question of the immigration policy, rather than attempt to correct injustices, individual by individual. Therefore, for the present, I ask that the bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

JOHN W. MCBRIDE

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 140) for the relief of John W. McBride, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause, and insert:

That sections 15 to 20, inclusive, of the act entitled "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes," approved September 7, 1916, as amended (5 U. S. C. 765-770), are hereby waived in favor of John W. McBride for compensation for disability caused by an injury allegedly sustained by him on or about March 13, 1943, while in the performance of his duties as an instructor at the Army Air Forces Technical School, Sioux Falls, S. Dak., and his claim is authorized and directed to be considered and acted upon under the remaining provisions of such act, as amended, if he files such claim with the Bureau of Employees' Compensation not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this act. No benefits shall accrue by reason of the enactment of this act for any period prior to the date of its enactment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

HARRY RAY SMITH

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 141) for the relief of Harry Ray Smith, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment on page 1, line 11, after the word "period", to insert "less any amounts earned by him through other employment during such period", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding any lapse of time or statute of limitations, the Court of Claims shall have jurisdiction to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claim of Harry Ray Smith against the United States for compensation which he would have received as an immigrant inspec-

tor, United States Immigration and Naturalization Service, during the period from July 11, 1938, to September 27, 1939, had he not been suspended from the Service during such period, less any amounts earned by him through other employment during such period. Suit on such claim may be instituted at any time within 1 year after the date of enactment of this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 153) for the relief of Wilhelm Engelbert was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. LANGER. Over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is heard, and the bill will go over.

SOCORRO GERONA DE CASTRO—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 173) for the relief of Socorro Gerona de Castro was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, may we have an explanation?

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, this bill grants the status of permanent residence in the United States to a 32-year-old native of the Philippine Islands who last arrived in the United States as a visitor on January 17, 1947. She is presently a resident physician in obstetrics and gynecology at Garfield Memorial Hospital in Washington, D. C., where hospital officials speak very highly of her and state that her services are urgently needed at the hospital.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask that the bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will go over.

SISTER ODILIA, ALSO KNOWN AS MARIA HUTTER—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 255) for the relief of Sister Odilia, also known as Maria Hutter, was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MORSE. May we have an explanation?

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, this bill grants the status of permanent residence in the United States to a 38-year-old native and citizen of Austria, who last arrived in the United States as a visitor on January 27, 1949. She is a nun attached to the Order of the Sisters of the Divine Saviour and presently stationed at the Divine Saviour Hospital in Portage, Wis., where she is engaged in duties as a registered nurse and training as a supervisor and other nursing work.

Mr. MORSE. Over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will go over.

GEORGE F. RUCKMAN

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 522) for the relief of George F. Ruckman, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment on page 1, line 5, after the figures "\$250", to strike out the comma and "together with interest thereon at the rate of 4 percent per annum from March 22, 1945, to the time of payment", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to George F. Ruckman the sum of \$250. The payment of such sum shall be in full satisfaction of the claim of the said George F. Ruckman against the United States for reimbursement for expenses incurred and paid out of his personal funds in repairing the B-17 bomber under his command which was damaged and forced to be landed in Torun, Poland, on February 3, 1945, following a bombing mission over Germany, and for reimbursement for expenses for quarters and rations for himself and his crew paid for by him during such period required for repairs: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

GEORGE RODNEY GILTNER, FORMERLY JOJI WAKAMIYA

The bill (S. 682) for the relief of George Rodney Giltner (formerly Joji Wakamiya) was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, may we have an explanation?

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, this bill provides for the admission into the United States of a minor Japanese child presently in the custody of and to be adopted by citizens of the United States. The purpose of the bill, as amended, is to provide for the admission of this child into the United States and for placing the child in the custody of Mr. and Mrs. William H. Giltner, citizens of the United States. The bill has been amended to bring it in line with appropriate sections of the new law, since the waiver is no longer a necessity. This child, who was born in Japan on February 5, 1948, has been released by the Kamakura Nursery for adoption by Mr. and Mrs. William H. Giltner, who are citizens of the United States.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, this bill is in line with the long-established policy of the Congress in connection with the adoption of children. It is in conformity with the well-established policy of our immigration laws, in the cases of a great many soldiers who have adopted babies and children abroad. I think

it is sound policy, and I have no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 682) for the relief of George Rodney Giltner—formerly Joji Wakamiya—which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause, and insert:

That, for the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, George Rodney Giltner (formerly Joji Wakamiya), shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. William H. Giltner, citizens of the United States.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SIZUKO KATO

The bill (S. 147) for the relief of Sizuko Kato, was announced as next in order.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, this bill would enable the Japanese fiancé and minor child of a United States citizen serviceman to enter the United States so that the fiancé may marry her citizen fiancé and that thereafter she and the child may reside in the United States.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, this is another bill that is consonant with well-established policy in regard to the marriage by American soldiers of women in the countries in which they have served. I think it is sound public policy, and I have no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 147) for the relief of Sizuko Kato, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Sizuko Kato and her minor child, Meechiko, the fiancé and minor child of Cpl. Gust L. Ulrich, a citizen of the United States, shall be eligible for visas as nonimmigrant temporary visitors for a period of 3 months: *Provided*, That the administrative authorities find that the said Sizuko Kato is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to the said Gust L. Ulrich and that they are found otherwise admissible under the immigration laws. In the event the marriage between the above-named persons does not occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Sizuko Kato and her minor child, Meechiko, they shall be required to depart from the United States and upon failure to do so shall be deported in accordance with the provisions of sections 241 and 242 of the Immigration and Nationality Act. In the event that the marriage between the above-named persons shall occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Sizuko Kato and her minor child, Meechiko, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of the said Sizuko Kato and her minor child, Meechiko, as of the date of the payment by them of the required visa fees.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Sizuko Kato and her minor child, Meechiko."

COMDR. JOHN J. O'DONNELL, UNITED STATES NAVAL RESERVE

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 720) for the relief of Comdr. John J. O'Donnell, United States Naval Reserve, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment on page 1, line 6, after the name "John J.", to strike out "O'Donnell" and insert "O'Donnell", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$252.67 to Comdr. John J. O'Donnell, United States Naval Reserve, in full settlement of his claims against the United States for pay and allowances for active training duty actually performed by him for the period of June 19 to 29, 1950, inclusive, in compliance with paragraph 1 of appropriate duty orders issued June 7, 1950, by the Commandant, 13th Naval District, Seattle, Wash.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Comdr. John J. O'Donnell, United States Naval Reserve."

AMENDMENT OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CREDIT UNIONS ACT

The bill (S. 873) to amend the District of Columbia Credit Unions Act was announced as next in order.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—this is a rather technical bill, and I wonder if, for the purposes of the RECORD, the Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE] will give us a brief explanation of the bill.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, the purpose of this bill, primarily, is to bring the District of Columbia Credit Unions Act in line with the Federal Credit Unions Act. The bill would amend existing law by—

First. Making two corrections of a minor nature, namely, changing the word "company" to read "credit union", and changing the words "payable to" to read "payable by."

Second. Eliminating the present limitation of 200 shares in the account of any 1 member, and permitting a credit-union member to own shares jointly with any person designated by him.

Third. Providing that after a reserve fund equal to 10 percent of the members' shareholdings has been established from the setting aside of 20 percent of the net

earnings of each year, no further transfer of net earnings to such fund will be required. It would also no longer require such reserve fund to be kept liquid and intact, thus permitting a District-chartered credit union to use such reserve fund for loans and other investments.

Hearings were held on Senate bill 873, and there was no opposition. It has the approval of the Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia Credit Union League, Inc., and the National Association of Credit Unions.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Maine for his explanation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (S. 873), to amend the District of Columbia Credit Unions Act, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted etc., That (a) paragraph 5 of section 7 of the District Columbia Credit Unions Act, as amended (26 D. C. Code, sec. 507), is amended by striking out "company" and inserting in lieu thereof "credit union". (b) Paragraph 11 of such section is amended by striking out "payable to" and inserting in lieu thereof "payable by".

Sec. 2. Section 9 of the District of Columbia Credit Unions Act, as amended (26 D. C. Code, sec. 509), is amended to read as follows:

"MEMBERSHIP"

"Sec. 9. Credit-union membership shall consist of the incorporators and such other persons or organizations as may be elected to membership and subscribe to at least one share, pay the initial installment thereon, and the entrance fee, if any; except that credit-union membership shall be limited to groups the members of which are actual residents of or do business or are employed within the District of Columbia, and either have a common bond of occupation, of association, or reside within a well-defined neighborhood or community. Shares may be issued in joint tenancy with right of survivorship with any persons designated by the credit union member, but no joint tenant shall be permitted to vote, obtain loans, or hold office, unless he is within the field of membership and is a qualified member."

Sec. 3. Section 12 of the District of Columbia Credit Unions Act, as amended (26 D. C. Code, sec. 512), is amended to read as follows:

"RESERVES"

"Sec. 12. All entrance fees and fines provided by the bylaws and 20 percent of the net earnings of each year, before the declaration of any dividends, shall be set aside as a reserve fund against bad loans or other losses, which fund shall not be distributed except in case of liquidation: *Provided, however,* That when the reserve fund thus established shall equal 10 percent of the total amount of members' shareholdings, no further transfer of net earnings to such reserve fund shall be required except that such amounts not in excess of 20 percent of the net earnings as may be needed to maintain this 10 percent ratio shall be transferred. In addition to such regular reserve, special reserves to protect the interests of members shall be established when required (a) by regulation, or (b) in any special case, when found by the Comptroller of the Currency to be necessary for that purpose."

PROPOSED DELEGATE FROM DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TO HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES — BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 697) to provide for a Delegate from the District of Columbia to the House of Representatives was announced as next in order.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], I request that the bill be passed over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

AMENDMENT OF DEPENDENTS ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1950

The bill (S. 1188) to amend the Dependents Assistance Act of 1950 to continue in effect certain of the provisions thereof was announced as next in order.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I wonder if I might ask the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts a question. Does the Senator from Massachusetts feel that this type of bill should be passed on a call of the calendar?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The answer is that I do, because it simply provides an extension of the present act until the Selective Service Act expires, on June 1, 1955. The bill would continue the dependency allowances, which is highly essential to the maintenance of morale in the lower grades of our Armed Forces.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. It merely extends an existing function?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is correct. It has been the law since June 1, 1950.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I thank the Senator from Massachusetts.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1188) to amend the Dependents Assistance Act of 1950 to continue in effect certain of the provisions thereof was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 16 of the Dependents Assistance Act of 1950 (Public Law 771, 81st Cong.) is amended by deleting the date "April 30, 1953" and inserting in lieu thereof the date "July 1, 1955."

LIMITATION OF NUMBER OF OFFICERS ON ACTIVE DUTY IN THE ARMED FORCES

The bill (H. R. 2332) to place temporary limitations on the number of officers serving on active duty in the Armed Forces, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, as I stated to the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee prior to the session today, I propose to offer an amendment to the pending bill which would correct two injustices against two career naval officers. The amendment is embodied in a bill submitted by the distinguished Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], for himself, the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL], the Senator

from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], and myself. The bill is Senate bill 1063.

Am I correct in understanding that if the amendment is not offered today the Committee on Armed Services will give a prompt hearing on the bill to which I have just referred?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The distinguished Senator from Michigan is correct. I talked it over with him and told him this was a bill for a special purpose, and it was very essential that it be passed promptly. I assure the Senator from Michigan that on the special bill which he has in mind we shall give a hearing within a month.

Mr. POTTER. I thank the Senator. I should like to count on the bill referred to by me being enacted. The Navy has brought about the necessity for this bill by giving inaccurate testimony when the so-called Davis amendment was considered last year.

The bill in which I am interested along with the Senators whom I have named also involves a case where the Department of the Navy has failed to carry out an administrative act when it had the opportunity, and it has opposed the proposed legislation to correct two injustices which it created. I thought the bill was most appropriate at this time, because both bills deal with the action of the Navy Department in giving the Congress inaccurate information.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator has told me that. The pending bill was introduced as a result of inaccurate information. The committee will certainly give a careful hearing to the bill which the Senator has in mind.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield. Mr. GORE. The committee report states that the bill under consideration is of a very temporary nature.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is correct. Mr. GORE. It is recommended by the committee, of which the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts is chairman, on the ground that a study is being made by the House Committee on Armed Services. I wonder if the Senate Armed Services Committee also is going to give consideration to this problem.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I would say to the Senator from Tennessee that this bill is to prevent the demotion of some 5,400 lieutenants because of a miscalculation, as I have just told the distinguished Senator from Michigan. I have talked with Representative ARENDS, who is the chairman of the subcommittee of the House Armed Services Committee which is investigating the whole act. I did not think it was wise to have duplication of effort. A House subcommittee is hearing the matter now, and Mr. ARENDS tells me it will be approximately a month before the subcommittee will be ready to report to the full committee.

When the House sends to the Senate such recommendations as it may care to make we shall then be guided by circumstances as to what to do. That, I think, would eliminate any duplication of effort.

Mr. GORE. The Senator is aware, I take it, that in many categories our armed services are topheavy in officers of high grade. It was for the purpose of remedying that situation that the Davis Act, which this bill seems to set aside temporarily, was enacted.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is correct.

Mr. GORE. At that time I was a member of the House Committee on Appropriations, as also was the distinguished author of the bill. There is a clearly recognized need for remedial action. I had hoped that the distinguished chairman of the Senate Committee on Armed Services would give assurance that his committee likewise would immediately undertake a study of this matter. Unless such assurance is forthcoming, I shall feel constrained to object to passage of the bill.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The only reason why the Senate Committee on Armed Services is not making a study as a committee is that the very same kind of study, for the very purpose which the Senator has recommended, is being made in the House, and I felt that the Senate committee would be in a better position to act when it could consider all the amendments made by the House in connection with this most complicated situation. The whole subject of personnel is very complicated. When the Senate committee can see what the House committee has reported, we can then decide what we should do. But if we should begin a study now, it would be the same study the House is making, and it would be conducted for the same purpose, namely, to prevent overloading at the top, and to make promotions fair.

To conduct a study now would be a complete duplication of the efforts of the House committee. Our heart is in the right place, but we are trying to conserve our efforts, because there is a very considerable amount of work to be done on other subjects.

Mr. GORE. If the House should fail to take action, the Senator from Massachusetts would not consider that such inaction on the part of the House would absolve the Senate from taking action on the problem, would he?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I would not. As has just been pointed out to me, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] last year headed a subcommittee which went into the subject, and the limitations which are now imposed on the number of upper grade officers—officers of general and flag rank—are less than those authorized by statute. In other words, the subcommittee last year, headed by the Senator from Mississippi, which had the responsibility of considering confirmation of such nominations recommended merely by implication, as it were, what it considered were wise reductions in the number of officers of flag and general rank. Therefore, it is not proposed to recommend the confirmation of officers of flag or general rank in the numbers authorized by statute, but rather in the numbers authorized by formal action of our committee. Have I made myself clear?

Mr. GORE. The Senator from Massachusetts always makes himself clear, and is always actuated by the finest motives and purposes.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I appreciate the Senator's statement.

Mr. GORE. In line with the Senator's traditional reputation of being actuated by higher motives, in the event the House fails to act on this question, will it be the purpose of the Senator's committee to study it?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The answer is very decidedly "Yes." However, I know that Members of the House feel very strongly about the subject, too.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I shall not object.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, when the Unanimous Consent Calendar is before the Senate, I have learned that the best practice is: When in doubt, object. I at least have found this discussion to be so completely lacking in clarity that I object.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I have tried to answer questions. If the Senator from Oregon will give me an opportunity to do so, I shall read an explanation of what the bill proposes to accomplish.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Will the Senator from Oregon withhold his objection?

Mr. MORSE. I shall be glad to withhold my objection.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, when the Defense Appropriation Act was being debated in the House last year, a floor amendment establishing a percentage limitation on the numbers of officers in various ranks in the several services was adopted. This was known as the Davis amendment.

The intent of the amendment was to put a freeze on promotions to the higher grades—flag and general officers, captains, and colonels, mainly.

There is no doubt that this was a worthy objective. Unfortunately, however, it was not achieved by the language of the Davis amendment. On the contrary, it seems that a substantial number of the younger and more junior officers, particularly those in the Navy, have either been denied promotions to which they are entitled, or actually face a reduction to a lower rank.

The House recognized that the Davis amendment, as adopted, had a completely unintended and unexpected effect. That includes the author of the amendment itself, Mr. Davis.

The pending bill, H. R. 2332, which passed the House a week ago Wednesday by unanimous vote of 370 to 0, seeks to remedy the situation, but on only a stop-gap basis. In the meantime, the Arends subcommittee of the House committee is going forward with a complete restudy of the Officer Personnel Act, to bring about a permanent adjustment, and standardization, of existing provisions which control the numbers of officers in the various ranks, and the methods of selection for promotion to higher rank.

I have talked with Representative ARENDS. His subcommittee started hearings last week. They hope to be able to

conclude their hearings and report to the full committee by the 1st of April.

The pending bill is of special urgency because of the fact that if remedial action is not taken prior to April 1, a very substantial number of junior officers, particularly in the Navy, will face reduction in rank. I understand that the number of officers involved is approximately 5,400.

Vice Adm. J. L. Holloway, Chief of Naval Personnel, appearing before the committee for the Department of Defense and the Navy, strongly urged the passage of the bill. Representative of the Army, Air Force, and Marine Corps were also present before the committee and supported the Navy's position. In other words, the bill proposes to take care of the situation up until July 1 of this year.

We are told that if the action proposed by the bill is not taken before April 1, some 5,400 junior officers will face reduction in rank.

Mr. Davis, himself, who was the author of the amendment, agrees to the bill, and was one of the Members who voted in the unanimous vote to pass the bill.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator from Oregon asked the question. I yield to him first.

Mr. MORSE. To the knowledge of the Senate Committee on Armed Services, how long has this situation existed?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. It has existed since the adjournment of the last Congress. I may say to the Senator from Oregon that, if my memory is correct, the item was included in the military appropriation bill which was passed in the very last days of the previous session.

Mr. MORSE. The problem has been known for a good many months, has it not?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should say that the problem has been known for the last 6 months.

Mr. MORSE. The committee still has until April 1 to get through the Senate a stop-gap measure which will really meet the problem basically, has it not?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. As the Senator from Oregon knows, the colleague of the junior Senator from Tennessee, the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], was chairman of a subcommittee a few years ago which drew a very comprehensive bill which became the Officer Personnel Act. It was the subject of discussion and consideration for a year or more. Now it appears that some obvious amendments should be made to the act. As I have tried to explain to the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Arends subcommittee of the House is now studying the subject. The Senate committee is very cognizant of the situation—so cognizant of it that, led by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] last year, the committee informally cut down the top authorization for officers of general and flag rank.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. If the Senator from Oregon has finished.

Mr. GORE. I desired to make a reply to the Senator.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee for that purpose.

Mr. GORE. The purpose of my questions to the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts was not to raise a question in the mind of the Senator from Oregon—

Mr. MORSE. The Senator did not.

Mr. GORE. Or of any other Senator about the advisability of passage of the bill now. My purpose was to elicit from the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services an assurance that his committee was, first, cognizant of the problem which the Davis amendment seems to have missed, and, further, that the Senate Committee on Armed Services would give study to it.

I was a participant in the adoption of the Davis amendment in the House. I now feel that the bill presently before the Senate should pass. I wish to make it clear that I have not raised the question in order to keep the bill from passing, but rather to elicit from the Senator from Massachusetts the assurance which he has now given.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I understand completely the purpose of the Senator from Tennessee in asking his question.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I shall object—let me say that I think the record is perfectly clear that this problem has been pending before the Armed Services Committee for many months. In my judgment, we ought to be dealing today not with stop-gap legislation but with legislation which would really correct the basic defects. I still think there is ample time between now and April 1 to do it. At least, there will be another call of the calendar between now and April 1 to allow opportunity to pass on this question. Apparently all concerned need an impetus to cause them to undertake to solve the real basic problem. Therefore I object.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, if the Senator from Oregon objects, that is the end of it for the moment; but I have asked the majority leader if he would move the consideration of this measure immediately, because it is the personal concern, the financial concern, and the moral concern of a very substantial number of our officers who are fighting a war today.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I shall use my 5 minutes now.

Let me say to the Senator from Massachusetts that he is perfectly at liberty, at any time he so desires, to make a motion on the floor of the Senate so as to surmount an objection to unanimous consent consideration. That is an old, hoary practice on the floor of the Senate.

I also wish to say to the chairman of the Armed Services Committee that, in my opinion, we ought to have before the Senate today the basic legislation necessary to solve this problem. The chairman of the committee himself admits that the existence of this problem has been known for many months. I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I wish to say in reply to the Senator from Oregon that the present Armed Services Committee did not come into existence until January of this year. There was an election last autumn, as a result of which we are very glad to see the present Presiding Officer sitting where he is.

This question cannot be determined in a month or 6 weeks. It will require a substantial amount of time.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, let me reply to the Senator from Massachusetts by saying that so far as I am concerned, his statement is most unacceptable rebuttal. I have seen major legislation go through the Armed Services Committee, with full hearings, in the course of 3 weeks. This is now March 9—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will say that there have been some remarks which have been slightly out of order from a parliamentary standpoint. The clerk will call the next measure on the calendar.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President—

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MORSE. Will the Chair advise the junior Senator from Oregon what remarks have been out of order?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair has been very lenient. The bill had gone over. The Chair had announced that fact. So the proper procedure was to proceed to the consideration of the next measure on the calendar.

The clerk will state the next measure on the calendar.

RECOGNITION OF DISTINGUISHED SERVICE OF COL. J. CLAUDE KIMBROUGH

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 709) to give proper recognition to the distinguished service of Col. J. Claude Kimbrough, which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services with an amendment on page 1, line 10, after the word "as", to strike out "military", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That in recognition of the outstanding service and contribution made to the science of medicine and surgery by Col. J. Claude Kimbrough, Medical Corps, United States Army, retired, and to provide that his mature professional judgment and long experience may continue to remain available to the public service, the President is hereby authorized to designate the said Col. J. Claude Kimbrough, upon his retirement from the active list, as consultant in urology at Walter Reed Army Medical Center, Washington, D. C. Such designation shall be subject to the said Col. J. Claude Kimbrough's acceptance and shall be terminable at his pleasure, or at the pleasure of the Secretary of the Army. During the time he serves under such designation, the said Col. J. Claude Kimbrough shall be entitled to receive, in lieu of his retired pay, the full active-duty pay and allowances to which he was entitled immediately prior to his retirement.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES OF OFFICE OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA ADMINISTRATOR OF RENT CONTROL

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 52) to enable the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to provide for administrative expenses of the Office of Administrator of Rent Control for the period ending April 30, 1953, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Resolved, That in order to provide for the necessary administrative expenses of the Office of Administrator of Rent Control of the District of Columbia for the period ending April 30, 1953, as authorized by Public Law 430, 82d Congress, approved June 30, 1952, there is hereby appropriated, out of the general fund of the District of Columbia, as defined in the District of Columbia Appropriation Act, 1953, the additional amount of \$17,000.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That completes the calendar.

LIMITATIONS ON NUMBER OF OFFICERS ON ACTIVE DUTY IN THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 72, House bill 2332.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 2332) to place temporary limitations on the number of officers serving on active duty in the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], that the Senate proceed to the consideration of this bill. Such a motion during the morning hour is not debatable.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I invite the attention of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] to the following three points: In the first place, there is ample time between now and April 1 for the consideration of this bill by the objector to the bill. There is ample time to resolve any differences which may have developed between the Senator from Massachusetts and the Senator from Oregon as to the procedure which has been followed in connection with this bill. I have not had an opportunity to study the bill.

I think the statements of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] on the floor of the Senate today indicate very clearly the desirability of further time for the consideration of the bill.

Secondly, I point out to the Senator from Ohio that this is early in the session. He may, as majority leader, wish to establish this precedent, but I respectfully advise him that there is a quite a long time between now and the time of adjournment of this session. If he wishes to take the position that a Member of the Senate who desires more time to consider a bill—and I have asked for further time to consider the bill—is to be denied it today, I will accept that as

his idea of the way to proceed parliamentarily when the Unanimous Consent Calendar is before the Senate. If the Senator from Ohio believes that in the long run he will save a great deal of time, as majority leader he may live to learn that this is not a time-saving device at all.

In the third place, I invite the attention of the Senator from Ohio again to the fact that once more we are confronted with the problem of what we are going to do about minority rights on the floor of the Senate, and whether or not the Unanimous Consent Calendar is to mean what the term implies, the requirement of unanimous consent to pass bills unless Members who object to bills have had adequate time to study them.

I leave it up to the majority leader. He is writing his record. I will respond to the record he writes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill (H. R. 2332) was ordered to a third reading and was read the third time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Alfken	Hendrickson	McCarthy
Anderson	Hennings	McClellan
Barrett	Hickenlooper	Millikin
Beall	Hill	Monroney
Bennett	Hoey	Morse
Bush	Holland	Mundt
Butler, Nebr.	Humphrey	Murray
Byrd	Hunt	Neely
Capehart	Ives	Potter
Carlson	Jackson	Purtell
Case	Jenner	Robertson
Chavez	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Clements	Johnson, Tex.	Saltonstall
Cooper	Johnston, S. C.	Schoepfel
Cordon	Kefauver	Smith, Maine
Dirksen	Kennedy	Smith, N. J.
Duff	Kerr	Smith, N. C.
Dworshak	Kilgore	Sparkman
Ellender	Knowland	Stennis
Ferguson	Kuchel	Symington
Frear	Langer	Taft
Fulbright	Lehman	Thye
George	Long	Tobey
Gillette	Magnuson	Watkins
Goldwater	Malone	Welker
Gore	Mansfield	Williams
Green	Martin	Young
Griswold	Maybank	
Hayden	McCarran	

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are absent on official business.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] are absent on official business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to speak for only a few minutes about the present parliamentary situation. I believe the facts to be very clear.

First, during the call of the Unanimous Consent Calendar, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] wished to have Calendar No. 72, House bill 2332, considered. I listened to the discussion, and when it was over I stated that I was not at all clear about the subject of the bill. I expressed the view that I believed the Armed Services Committee should have before the Senate proposed legislation which would solve this problem permanently, but I stated that I wanted time to study the matter.

After hearing me say that I was going to object, the Senator from Massachusetts advised me that the majority leader had informed him that if there was objection to the bill, a motion would be made to take up the bill.

That brings up the issue of whether we are going to proceed in conformity with what I believe to be clearly the spirit and intent of the Unanimous Consent Calendar procedure, which requires unanimous consent for the consideration and passage of a bill on the calendar, to the end that any Senator who objects may have time to study the bill. It raises the question of whether in the Senate of the United States the point has been reached where, when one Member of the Senate who is not very popular with some, particularly with a majority of the Members on this side of the aisle, objects, then the whistle of the steamroller will be blown, and the majority will proceed to roll over the objection merely because the Senator who objected wishes to exercise his rights under the Unanimous Consent Calendar rule.

Mr. President, it is up to my colleagues today to decide whether they wish to establish that precedent.

I respectfully say that the Senator from Massachusetts has rebutted himself. In his own discussion of the bill he has pointed out that no great emergency in connection with the bill will arise until April 1. This is March 9. So we shall have at least one calendar call, and possibly more, between now and April 1.

Regardless of the attitude of the Senator from Massachusetts toward me—and I know full well what his attitude is off the floor of the Senate—let me say that under the rules of the Senate he, as chairman of the Armed Services Committee, should have the wisdom to follow the long-established practice in connection with Unanimous Consent Calendar procedure, by permitting any Senator, regardless of who he may be—even the junior Senator from Oregon—to have adequate time to study the record involved in any particular bill. That is the position I have taken.

Mr. President, I wish to say that we are going to find out here today whether that kind of courtesy is going to be extended to all 96 Members of the Senate. I will fight to have the same courtesy right extended to any other Member of the Senate, even including the Senator from Massachusetts, because I think we

are faced here with a question of great substance. In this particular instance we are faced with the question of whether each Member of the Senate will be protected in what I believe to be an unwritten rule of the Unanimous Consent Calendar procedure. In other words, I believe that each Senator has a right to study a bill before it is steamrollered over his objection, by way of motion to consider the bill. I wish to say to the Senator from Massachusetts that I think he knows me well enough, having served with me for many years on the Armed Services Committee, to realize full well that once I have an opportunity to study a bill and once I find the situation is such that the equities and justice call for immediate passage of the bill, I will give my approval of the bill at the next call of the calendar.

If, on the other hand, I consider there is any basis for a suspicion that the Navy has been at fault in the past in presenting to the Armed Services Committee some unreliable evidence, then I believe the Navy should be brought up to the line and I should furnish clear explanations upon which the committee can rely.

I do not make threats; but as a Member of the Senate, with rights equal to those of any other Member of the Senate, I wish to say that I will find out today, by the action taken in this instance, whether the Senate intends to extend to me the courtesy which I believe is due me under the long-established policies in connection with procedures and practices when the Unanimous Consent Calendar is called. In short, I will learn whether I am going to be given an opportunity, as the Member of the Independent Party on the floor of the Senate, to study calendar bills before they are finally passed, or whether the attitude of other Members will be that they are going to steamroller the bills through the Senate, regardless of my objections.

If that is going to be the view of the Senate, I will do the best I can in the future to try to protect myself by appropriate parliamentary action. But let us have an understanding now about where we stand on the Unanimous Consent Calendar procedure.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield to me?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New Jersey will state it.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I understand that at this time we are operating under rule VIII.

Mr. MORSE. That is not my understanding.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New Jersey is correct.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Then, Mr. President, if we are operating under rule VIII, all the argument made by the Senator from Oregon is out of order, in my judgment.

Mr. MORSE. Let us discuss that. Today we have had a call of the Unanimous Consent Calendar. We went through

the calendar. After the call of the Unanimous Consent Calendar was completed, a motion was made by the majority leader that House bill 2332, Calendar No. 72, be considered. The majority leader did not make his motion under rule VIII, Mr. President. He moved that House bill 2332, Calendar No. 72, be made the business before the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON] is correct in his statement that the motion to consider the bill was made under rule VIII. The call of the calendar had been concluded, and the Senator from Ohio at that time made the motion.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. The motion was made immediately following objection to the consideration of the bill in accordance with the rule.

Mr. MORSE. No, Mr. President; the Senator had finished the calendar.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The motion was made at the conclusion of the call of the calendar.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, let me read rule IX. It is not rule VIII, it is rule IX, which reads as follows:

Immediately after the consideration of cases not objected to upon the calendar is completed, and not later than 2 o'clock if there shall be no special orders for that time, the Calendar of General Orders shall be taken up and proceeded with in its order, beginning with the first subject on the calendar next after the last subject disposed of in proceeding with the calendar; and in such case the following motions shall be in order at any time as privileged motions, save as against a motion to adjourn, or to proceed to the consideration of executive business, or questions of privilege, to wit:

First. A motion to proceed to the consideration of an appropriation or revenue bill.

Second. A motion to proceed to the consideration of any other bill on the calendar, which motion shall not be open to amendment.

Third. A motion to pass over the pending subject, which if carried shall have the effect to leave such subject without prejudice in its place on the calendar.

Fourth. A motion to place such subject at the foot of the calendar.

Each of the foregoing motions shall be decided without debate and shall have precedence in the order above named, and may be submitted as in the nature and with all the rights of questions or order.

So, Mr. President, what has happened is that, proceeding in strict accordance with rules VIII and IX, we are now taking up, on motion, one of the bills which was passed over, as provided for and intended by the Rules of the Senate. When we reach the hour of 2 o'clock, the question will then be whether the Senate desires to make this bill the unfinished business of the Senate. But during the morning hour, the motion was made and is being considered. The effect of the motion is to remove the 5-minute limitation on debate, and the Senator from Oregon can talk until 2 o'clock, at which time the question of making the bill the unfinished business of the Senate may be raised. I think that is a correct statement of the rules.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is properly before the Senate. The Senator from Oregon is in order, and may proceed.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I want to get the parliamentary situation

straight. I thought I had it straight. I went to the desk and talked with the Parliamentarian. Apparently I completely misunderstood him. As I understood, his statement was that it would be possible to proceed under rule VIII, but that we were not proceeding under rule VIII; we were proceeding under the motion of the Senator from Ohio to make House bill 2332 the unfinished business of the Senate for the time being, and that the rule governing procedure at the hour of 2 o'clock did not apply. But apparently the Parliamentarian said something to the contrary, and I completely misunderstood him. The purpose of my inquiry of the Parliamentarian, when I went to the desk, was to ascertain exactly the parliamentary situation at that time, and I understood it was his interpretation that we were proceeding with this measure as the unfinished business of the Senate. I asked the Parliamentarian what was pending when the Senate adjourned last Friday. I thought there was some business pending before the Senate, and I asked him what the status of that business was. He said nothing was pending when the Senate adjourned on Friday until today; that today a call of the calendar would be in order; and, when we finished with the calendar, then, I understood the Parliamentarian to say, the Senator from Ohio could, by motion, make this bill the unfinished business of the Senate. If I misunderstood the Parliamentarian, I am sorry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will inform the Senator from Oregon that when a motion is made at the conclusion of the call of the calendar to take up a bill which was on the calendar, then at 2 o'clock, if there is pending business, the particular bill, if its consideration shall not then have been completed, goes back on the calendar. In this instance, no pending business being before the Senate, the precedent has been established that this bill becomes the pending business and will continue, after 2 o'clock, until disposed of. The Senator from Oregon is correct in his understanding of the parliamentary situation.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state the inquiry.

Mr. TAFT. At 2 o'clock, I intend to move to proceed with the consideration of the Executive Calendar. What will be the status after the consideration of the Executive Calendar shall have been completed? Will this bill, or will it not, be the unfinished business of the Senate, and how does it get to be so?

The VICE PRESIDENT. A motion to consider the Executive Calendar is a privileged motion, and will be considered when it is made, but, according to the precedents, as the Chair is advised by the Parliamentarian, when there is no pending business and a motion is made at the conclusion of the calendar, as in this instance to consider a bill which is on the calendar, such bill becomes the pending business.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state the inquiry.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. At the time the objection was made to this bill, on the call of the calendar, would not the Senator from Massachusetts have had the right to move to take up the bill under rule VIII?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Yes; the Senator from New Jersey is correct; and had the Senator from Massachusetts done that, the bill could have been taken up in that manner; but it was not handled in that way. As the Senator will recall, the bill went over, and the Senate concluded the calendar. At the conclusion of the calendar, the Senator from Ohio moved to consider the bill.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. In light of that situation, Mr. President, I may say that much of the argument made by the Senator from Oregon was not relevant to the issue before the Senate.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the Senator from New Jersey may say so, but for his benefit I am going to repeat most of that argument. In order to show him that I think it is most relevant to the situation I shall restate it in a little different way, and from a little different angle. He will then, perhaps, see my point a little more clearly.

Mr. President, I have no intention of speaking until 2 o'clock, because I do not propose to use any parliamentary tactic to cause a postponement of the consideration of this issue. We are going to vote on this issue today. We are going to find out today whether we are to follow what the Parliamentarian said. I hope the Parliamentarian will not tell me now that I misunderstood something else he told me at the desk. I asked the Parliamentarian whether the procedure followed by the Senator from Ohio in this matter had been very common in the history of the Senate, and he replied that it has not been a very common one; which brings me right down to the kernel of the situation as I see it. The situation here today was that a Member of the Senate objected to a bill and asked that it go over. In my 8 years in the Senate, I have seen that happen scores of times, Mr. President, and time has been given until the next calendar day, for the objecting Senator to study the bill. Other Senators may say it has not been the common practice, but I have been led to believe that it is, and I think that is a proper description of what the practice has been.

The record is very clear, from the lips of the Senator from Massachusetts, the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, himself, that there is no essential need for the passage of this bill prior to April 1. That is when the emergency will arise. There will be a call of the consent calendar between now and April 1. I have asked for the right to study this bill until the next calendar day.

Mr. President, I close by leaving it to the Senate as to whether, in effect, the Senate wants to apply another rule of the Senate, and stand on that rule, in order to put a bill through the Senate when Senators know very well that one of their colleagues has asked for time in

which to study the bill. Senators are writing the record, and in the future I shall act upon the basis of the record that is written today.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. MORSE. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

The bill (H. R. 2332) was passed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no reports of committees, the clerk will proceed to state the nominations on the executive calendar.

HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE ADMINISTRATION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Albert M. Cole, to be Housing and Home Finance Administrator.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, this is a remarkable appointment. Mr. Cole is proposed as Administrator of a program which he has opposed. He has opposed it completely and immoderately.

It has always been my position that a nominee whose confirmation is before the Senate need not be a person with whom I agree. At this time, I will not reiterate the criteria which the Senate has used in passing upon Executive nominations.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. For what purpose?

Mr. MAYBANK. This is a very important nomination, and, without taking the Senator off the floor, I really think we ought to have a quorum call.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from South Carolina for that purpose?

Mr. MORSE. No. I am interested, I may say to my good friend from South Carolina, only in making my record. I am perfectly aware as of this moment of the attitude that most of the other Members of the Senate have just expressed on the floor of the Senate concerning their opinion of the views of the junior Senator from Oregon. I simply want to advise them that I think they are going to live to learn with surprise that there is much greater interest across the country in the views of the Senator from Oregon than apparently there is on the floor of the Senate. So from this desk today I shall speak to the country about Mr. Cole. The issue must be made clear.

Mr. MAYBANK. I have no intention of suggesting that the Senator is not doing that. The only suggestion I had in mind to make was that, on the consideration of the Executive Calendar I think we ought to have a quorum call. I do not wish to be misunderstood. I am going to vote to confirm Mr. Cole's nomination.

Mr. MORSE. I am not interested in a quorum call.

Mr. MAYBANK. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Oregon yield for that purpose?

Mr. MORSE. I do not yield for that purpose.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Oregon has the floor.

Mr. MORSE. But, certainly, Mr. President, an indispensable condition of confirmation is that the nominee be free of a bias which would interfere with the administration of his office. In this case, the question arises in connection with a comprehensive program for housing established by the Congress. That program is a bipartisan one. We are not considering the administration of an agency for which the executive department has primary responsibility.

The normal presumption in passing upon a nomination submitted by the President is that the President should, in the absence of compelling reasons to the contrary, have the executive officers whom he desires. That presumption is of less force where the program to be administered is one which was established by the Congress. In such a case, the Senate may properly consider whether the appointee can be expected to discharge his duties in a way that fulfills the intent of Congress.

The administration of the Housing Act of 1949 comprises the major portion of the duties of the office to which Cole is nominated. The act established certain housing programs and objectives which are clearly stated. The achievement of them requires administrative discretion—and the act conferred such discretion. For instance, he can determine the interest rates for mortgages under FHA. And in lesser ways the Administrator can forward or defeat the goals of this important legislation. Mr. Cole conceded this during the hearings—page 20:

Senator DOUGLAS. * * * An unsympathetic Administrator can always put roadblocks in the way of specific projects on the grounds that the site is not suitable or that this or that is not suitable.

Mr. COLE. I understand.

Senator DOUGLAS. And therefore, in effect, he can prevent the will of Congress from being carried out.

Mr. COLE. I would agree that it could be done that way.

Cole's opposition to this vital housing program is a matter of record.

He was a member of the House Banking and Currency Committee during his 6 years as a Representative. Normally that would be evidence of excellent qualifying experience for the program which was considered and advocated by that committee in 1949.

But his record was one of total opposition. In his extended speech on the act in 1949—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 95, part 6, pages 8150-8152—which was long by House standards—he stated his condemnation of each and every portion of that measure.

His final indictment was that the Housing Act of 1949 had potentialities for strangling America. Even allowing for the extravagance which sometimes unfortunately accompanies debate on a bill, his implacable opposition to and overwhelming lack of sympathy with this program renders him incapable of discharging his duties under it in conformity with congressional policy.

He stated unequivocally during the hearings on the confirmation of his nomination that he had not changed his views—page 16:

Mr. COLE. Perhaps you misunderstood me. I have not changed my opinion. Have I indicated that I changed my opinion? If so, I beg your pardon. I have not changed my personal opinion about it.

And on page 21, he stated:

Mr. COLE. The term "public housing" I still do not like.

Senator DOUGLAS. Well, it happens to be in the act.

Mr. COLE. Well, maybe it is. I do not know.

At the outset of the hearings, Cole stated that, despite his personal opposition to the Housing Act, it is the law of the land and he would respect and administer it as such.

Laudable as this sentiment is, I am convinced that his record and his own utterances during the hearing on March 2, demonstrate that he cannot do so. Nor can the Senate gamble on his ability to do so in the face of great odds.

In the course of the hearings, some Senators observed that the congressional policy embodied in the Housing Act may be changed. This is the prerogative of the Congress. Until such change takes place—openly, after investigation and debate—it is the solemn obligation of the Administrator to fulfill the mandate of the legislature.

What is Cole's conception of his functions? The hearings shed light on this. He stated, page 15:

Mr. COLE. Let me say this to you: One directive has been given me by the White House. One directive. That directive is that I conduct a study of the housing program.

In my judgment, that is not the job assigned by Congress. That is not the job inherent in the act.

If the President wishes to consider modification or abolition of this program, he has the means to do so. The study can be undertaken, proposals submitted to Congress, and considered by it. Members of the public have a right to know what the Government is thinking about and be given the opportunity to make their views known.

Congress must require that the Administrator of its program discharge his statutory functions. It seems that the administration did not propose Cole with that intention, if I correctly interpret the innuendoes and implications of Mr. Cole's own testimony.

An administrator can, of course, express his views upon proposed changes and the committees of Congress often solicit such comments. But that is not his primary function.

Is there any indication that Cole safely could be entrusted with this program? He related in his testimony the following incident during consideration of the 1949 Housing Act:

So, when I finally came to the final vote on it, I said to myself, "I am not opposed to housing. My record shows I am not opposed to housing."

He did not say that to the House, nor to anyone else, so far as the record shows. He was very careful in his testimony before the committee to say nothing about public housing.

That is slim evidence, indeed, on which to base a finding that Cole can be sympathetic to any form of public housing.

On the record made before the Banking and Currency Committee it seems clear that Cole cannot be expected to discharge his duties in harmony with the congressional purposes enunciated in the Housing Act of 1949.

Furthermore, the Senate should not invite the emasculation of this program by executive fiat. We want an Administrator, not a one-man law revision commission.

The Housing needs of the country are chronic. The present program is a vital necessity if we are to have any appreciable progress in slum clearance, low-cost housing, some measure of amelioration in the congestion caused by our immense defense program.

This is what Cole has to say about this, page 4:

Mr. COLE. Senator, as conditions warrant it I believe the Government should gradually get out of the housing business. I think government should support housing and not supplant it—support the housing industry; the people who are building houses. They should support it and not supplant it.

That must be music to the ears of the contractors of the country, Mr. President.

I wish to digress from my prepared remarks long enough to say that I shall retain my interest in the people who need housing. I am satisfied that the contractors can take care of themselves, but I know the little people cannot. I know something about the plight of the little people in congested areas of America who need public housing, who need slum clearance. Today I shall not be a party to voting for confirmation of the nomination of a man who has already testified where his interest is—not in the little people, but in those who build houses. The administration proposes to make him the administrator of an act passed by the Congress of the United States which was aimed to help the little people in America who need public housing.

Not only is this nomination shocking, Mr. President, but I shall do my best to help the little people in America remember the blow to their interest which the Eisenhower administration is striking against them today in submitting the nomination.

Of course, the program in part provides assistance to individuals and to the housing industry. It provides also for grants to local public authorities to provide low-rent housing where private groups will not or cannot do so.

The Public Housing Authority has provided for Negroes housing relief which simply has not been otherwise available. It must be continued. The colored population of America knows what it means to be exploited in regard to their housing. One can go within almost a stone's throw of the Capitol Building and see such exploitation and its shocking consequences.

"Leave such housing to those who build houses," says Mr. Cole. The record is clear that if it is left to those who build houses, the result will be exploitation, so far as colored people and many other little people are concerned, once they lose the friendly assistance of such an act as was passed in 1949, and are denied at least an unbiased, impartial administrator of that act.

This nomination is unfortunately similar to the nominations of Wilson, Kyes, Talbott, and Douglas. In each case a man has been proposed whose past activities, associations, or attitudes come into head-on conflict with the program he is supposed to supervise.

Mr. President, I say that such choices as these are dangerous for the little people of America. In my judgment, it is the obligation of the United States Senate today to withhold approval of this nomination. In the interest of the people of America who need public housing, I shall vote against the confirmation of the nomination of a man whose record shows he is not a friend, so far as the housing issue is concerned, of the little people of America, but who admits he is interested in taking care of builders.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I wish to make crystal clear for the record of the United States Senate what I know about public housing which, to my mind, is simply slum clearance. I was mayor of Charleston, S. C., in 1933, when public housing was first commenced under Secretary of the Interior Ickes. The second public housing project built in the United States was built in my city, the first having been built in Detroit.

Long, long ago, as a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, I supported the so-called Wagner-Elender-Taft bill. Likewise, I supported the Taft-Elender-Wagner bill. The bill was twice defeated.

I gave to the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], who sits besides me, a bill to be introduced for the committee, which carried as one of its titles the so-called public housing law.

I believe in the poor people, as does the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. I knew Representative Cole when he was a member of the House Committee on Banking and Currency, and I saw him frequently. I knew him to be an honorable man. I knew he was opposed to public housing, but that does not mean that he will not carry out the mandate of Congress.

All I desire to have the RECORD show is that, at the request of my Democratic

colleagues I, as ranking member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, questioned Mr. Cole. I wish to read what Representative Cole answered in response to my questions, so that the RECORD may be clear, and there will be no misunderstanding on the part of contractors and housing officials. The advocates of public housing from New York to California know my record. I have been a Member of the Senate for more than 12 years. Prior to that I was Governor of South Carolina, where I sponsored the housing law which was enacted by the legislature of my State. As I have said, I was mayor of Charleston in 1931.

I desire to read into the RECORD the statement and testimony of Mr. Cole, as follows:

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am grateful for the invitation extended me to appear before this committee in its consideration of my recent nomination as Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency.

I am fully cognizant of the great responsibility entailed in the office of Administrator of HHFA.

During the 6 years I was a member of the House Banking and Currency Committee I had an opportunity, as many of you have had, to familiarize myself rather thoroughly with the many problems with which the Congress has had to cope in shaping the various Government housing programs.

I have also a deep and sincere respect for the mandates of the Congress. I pledge you my most earnest endeavor to administer fairly and honorably those laws and responsibilities entrusted to my jurisdiction.

I assume, Mr. Chairman, that the committee may wish to question me in order to better advise the Senate with respect to my confirmation.

Senator MAYBANK. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask a question.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator MAYBANK.

Senator MAYBANK. When the so-called public housing program first came up, it was the Wagner-Elender-Taft bill, and then it was the Taft-Elender-Wagner bill. Those bills unfortunately did not pass.

Later on, I introduced a bill together with some 20 Senators, I think. You are familiar with that?

Mr. COLE. Yes. The Housing Act of 1949? Senator MAYBANK. Yes. You opposed that?

Mr. COLE. I voted against it; yes, sir.

Senator MAYBANK. You say:

"I have a deep and sincere respect for the mandates of Congress. I pledge you my most earnest endeavor to administer fairly and honorably those laws and responsibilities entrusted to my jurisdiction."

Now I do not know whether the law might have been good for your district or bad for your district. In South Carolina we had the same situation. It probably was not the best thing for your district, but on the other hand, was good, as a whole, for the United States. When you take office you will of course, look at it from a national standpoint; look at it from the standpoint that the bill is the law of the land?

Mr. COLE. Senator, I definitely and vigorously support that position.

Then I placed in the RECORD the names of those who had voted for the Housing Act of 1949. I shall not take the time of the Senate to read these long hearings. However, when Mr. Cole told me that he respected the laws of this land, that he was going to administer the laws as they were, and that he would not in any wise attempt before any committee

to undo the laws or to seek to have the laws changed, I voted for him, and I intend to vote for the confirmation of his nomination today.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield to the distinguished former chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency. We fought this battle together.

Mr. TOBEY. I ask the Senator from South Carolina if he does not believe, as I do, that it is good, sound policy, when the Congress has spoken on a great national policy such as public housing, to see that those who are friendly to the law are placed in charge of its administration?

Mr. MAYBANK. I will say to the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire, who was chairman of the committee in the 80th Congress, and who knows that I voted with him on many issues, that it is not a question of my putting someone in office to administer the law. That is a question for the President, whose duty it is to appoint persons who will carry out his policies. The President could have submitted the name of some other nominee.

Mr. TOBEY. But the Senator and I might become accessories after the fact.

Mr. MAYBANK. I can only say that I was an accessory before the fact in voting for the Housing Act. My former chairman knows that.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I rise to speak in opposition to the nomination of Albert M. Cole to be Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency. I wish to make it abundantly clear at the outset that my opposition is not based merely on a desire to oppose, because it is my strong desire to support the President of the United States whenever I can do so in good conscience. However, I believe this is a most unfortunate nomination.

I have no personal acquaintance with Mr. Cole. I understand, however, that he enjoys an excellent reputation as a man and as a former Representative in Congress. My opposition to his nomination is not directed toward his intelligence, his honesty, or his sincerity, all of which have been vouched for by persons whose opinions I respect, including Members of the Senate. I believe, too, that the President should have wide latitude on the selection of his key administrators.

In this case, however, there are compelling reasons why I cannot vote in the affirmative. These reasons are supported by many telegrams and letters received, not only from my own State but from many other States as well.

There are several reasons for my opposition. The first of these is Mr. Cole's record with respect to housing legislation during his service as a Representative in Congress. So far as I can determine, Mr. Cole has consistently, in speech and action, stated and voted his complete opposition to the public housing program.

His dislike and distrust of the public housing program has been reflected not only in his actions on legislative bills, but also on appropriations. In fact, his

opposition to public housing has apparently colored his understanding and acceptance of other phases of the Federal housing program which came into being as a result of the Housing Act of 1949. I refer among other things to slum clearance, research, and farm housing.

The best evidence of Mr. Cole's views in regard to public housing and other housing programs are his own statements.

I quote a few excerpts from speeches or statements of Mr. Cole:

For the following reasons I object to the low-rent housing plan:

The first objection is that it is privileged and discriminatory housing.

Secondly, it will not clear the slums.

Third, the poorer folks will not be housed under this program.

Fourth, it builds a tremendous political machine.

Fifth, it violates the rights of minorities.

Sixth, it is excessive in cost and there are no brakes on the excessive cost.

Seventh, it tends to destroy private homes and private business.

And eighth, it tends to destroy our form of government. (Source: CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 95, pt. 6, p. 8151.)

There certainly can be no doubt in the mind of anyone regarding his deep-rooted and complete bias against public housing.

I quote Mr. Cole again on public housing legislation:

There is a slender, almost indistinguishable thread running through this entire bill. That thread is government control of the individual family life, the individual home, the individual. Read the bill carefully from the beginning, the declaration of policy, through the slum-clearance proposition, through the low-rent plan, down through the research program, and, finally, to the farm housing, in which the farmers are regimented, and you will then find, Mr. Chairman, that this threat may become so strong as to strangle the people of America. (Source: CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 95, pt. 6, p. 8152.)

Certainly these intemperate statements indicate clearly a prejudice against the law which, in spite of the best intentions of the nominee, would prejudice any objective administration of his agency.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York be kind enough to yield?

Mr. LEHMAN. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator from New York not agree with me that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] went to the very heart of the problem before the Senate when he asked this question a few minutes ago: Do we not have an obligation to confirm as the administrator of a congressional act someone who, on the record, is at least friendly to the act? Does not the Senator agree with me that that goes to the very heart of the problem?

Mr. LEHMAN. I wish to make it very clear that my feeling is that it would be unfortunate, unfair, and unwise to appoint anyone to administer an act of Congress who was unfriendly to the act, as this man has clearly indicated he is.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator agree with me that if we think the act ought to be repealed, modified, or emasculated, we ought to do it ourselves, and not appoint someone who has a record such as the Senator has just indicated, and who obviously is so biased that we could take judicial notice of the fact that he could not possibly administer the act within its spirit and intent?

Mr. LEHMAN. I agree fully, of course, with my distinguished colleague from Oregon. This man has shown by his words and actions that he could not possibly evaluate or appraise this law in any objective manner. Therefore he certainly could not give advice to the Congress which would be of any value, or which could possibly be considered entirely disinterested.

Mr. MORSE. If the Senator will further yield, let us consider a question or two dealing with the very type of objections and criticisms which Mr. Cole has made with respect to this act.

The Senator from New York, in his many years of distinguished service in public life, particularly during his governorship of the State of New York, had a great deal to do with the problem of better housing for the little people of America. Is it the opinion of the Senator from New York that when we help the so-called little people, the people of small means whose home environments are pitiful, to live in decent homes, we make bad Americans out of them, or good Americans?

Mr. LEHMAN. Of course, we seek to make good Americans out of them. I think the great test of a man's public service is his effort to raise the standard of living of those citizens who unfortunately have not been privileged to the same degree that many of their fellows have been privileged. There are hundreds of thousands of such people in the State of New York, and I have no doubt that there are many thousands of them in the State so ably represented by the distinguished Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. This nominee, according to the quotations which the Senator from New York has just read, says in effect that the kind of housing program provided by the law is a threat to Americanism. Is that not the position of the nominee?

Mr. LEHMAN. Certainly he has taken that position. He goes even further and says with a rhetorical flourish that the public housing program—I am now quoting Mr. Cole—"is a thread which may become so strong as to strangle the people of America."

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator from New York agree with me that undesirable housing conditions, such as the type of housing one observes in certain areas of Washington, D. C., which are inhabited by our Negro population, and some of which are within a few blocks of the Capitol itself—filthy, unsanitary, and inadequate—constitute conditions and environments in which Communists like to work?

Mr. LEHMAN. The distinguished Senator from Oregon is absolutely right. There is no doubt about it at all that such conditions present very fertile

ground for the development of Communists. These conditions constitute some of our most dangerous breeding grounds of communism.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator from New York agree with me that the improvement of such conditions by the Government through a public housing program, with the building done by private contractors, which apparently Mr. Cole is completely overlooking—and they do not lose any money by that kind of construction work—not only makes better Americans out of such people, but helps us to strike an effective body blow at Communist propaganda in the United States? Does the Senator from New York agree with me?

Mr. LEHMAN. I fully agree with the Senator from Oregon. What particularly interested me in the testimony of Mr. Cole before the Committee on Banking and Currency—and I might say that I was prevented by a cold from attending the hearings, but I read the report very carefully—was that he said he was not against some slum clearance. However, he did not explain how one could possibly provide slum clearance without making some reasonable provision for better public housing, in which the people who are removed from the slums could be lodged.

Mr. MORSE. I hope the Senator from New York will join with me in trying—and I underline the word trying—to get a yea-and-nay vote on the nomination. I have failed on several occasions to get the Senate on record on other issues. I hope we will be able to have a year-and-nay vote on this nomination.

Mr. LEHMAN. Before I conclude my remarks I will certainly ask for a yea-and-nay vote on the nomination.

I want to thank my distinguished colleague from Oregon, and to say that I am in complete agreement with him. I am sure we will have a great deal more to say about the issue before the end of the afternoon.

I quote another statement made by Mr. Cole in reference to housing legislation:

I oppose the bill because I feel it is discriminatory between all types of people * * *. I intend to oppose the bill on that basis.

The source of that quotation is the hearings of the Committee on Banking and Currency, House of Representatives, 81st Congress, H. R. 4009, April-May 1949.

The second of my reasons for opposing the confirmation of Mr. Cole is the firm belief that no sincere and honest man, and I believe Mr. Cole to be both sincere and honest, can, contrary to his sincere convictions, efficiently carry out and administer a program to which he is unalterably opposed. With the background of his expressed views and his votes, we cannot expect Mr. Cole to seek to justify a substantial program of public housing units for the next year and the years that lie ahead. I ask unanimous consent to print the voting record of Mr. Cole on the issue of low-rent public housing.

There being no objection, the voting record was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Voting record of Hon. Albert M. Cole on issue of low-rent public housing

Issue	Mr. Cole's vote
June 29, 1949: Rees (Republican, Kansas) amendment to strike public housing title from the Housing Act of 1949. (Public housing won, 209 to 204.)	For the amendment; against public housing.
June 29, 1949: Final passage of the Housing Act of 1949. (Passed, 228 to 185.)	Against.
May 4, 1951: Gossett (Democrat, Texas) amendment to reduce public housing starts to 5,000 for fiscal year 1952. (Passed, 181 to 113.)	For the amendment; against public housing.
July 25, 1951: Vote to recommit independent offices appropriation bill with instructions to reduce public housing starts to 5,000 units. (Passed, 188 to 186.)	Recorded as not voting.
Aug. 15, 1951: Second vote to recommit independent offices appropriation bill with instructions to reduce public housing starts to 5,000 units. (Defeated, 206 to 169.)	For recommitment; against public housing.
Mar. 21, 1952: Fisher (Democrat, Texas) amendment to reduce public housing starts to 5,000 units for fiscal year 1953. (Passed 192 to 168.)	For the amendment; against public housing.
June 26, 1952: Vote to recommit independent offices appropriation bill to conference with instructions to reduce public housing starts to 5,000 units for fiscal year 1953. (Passed 195 to 181.)	For recommitment; against public housing.
July 2, 1952: Second vote to recommit independent offices appropriation bill to conference with instructions to reduce public housing starts to 5,000 units for fiscal year 1953. (Defeated 193 to 160.)	Recorded as not voting.

Mr. LEHMAN. It will be seen from the voting record that Mr. Cole voted against the appropriation for a substantial number of public housing starts. He voted to cut the public housing program down to 5,000 units, which, of course, was just a way of killing the public housing program altogether.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I shall vote to confirm the nomination of Mr. Cole, but I wonder whether the Senator from New York will agree with me that on the independent offices appropriation bill I had to fight for a long time in order to have justice done to the poor people of our country. That was in connection with the independent offices appropriation bill, however, not in connection with the bill before the Committee on Banking and Currency. The Senator from New York will agree with that statement, I assume.

Mr. LEHMAN. Yes; I show what the situation was with respect to Mr. Cole's voting record.

Mr. MAYBANK. Yes.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I may say that I shall always recall with a great deal of gratitude and appreciation the yeoman service performed by the distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] in behalf of the public housing program. The President of the United States had recommended funds for 75,000 public housing units, which was still below the authorized level. The House cut the amount to 5,000 units. The bill came to the Senate and the Senator from South Carolina will recall that I introduced an amendment raising the number to 50,000 units. The

Senator from South Carolina went along with the amendment, but he was very frank to say that when the bill got to the House he did not believe the House would sustain the 50,000-unit appropriation.

When the bill was sent to conference, because of the inspired leadership of the distinguished Senator from South Carolina the number of units was set at 35,000.

Mr. MAYBANK. I appreciate the Senator's remarks.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. Cole sought in every way to cut the number to 5,000 units.

Mr. MAYBANK. I want it understood that it was the Senate of the United States that voted for the 35,000 units. I was chairman of the conference committee, and I went along with what the Senate did.

Mr. LEHMAN. The Senate did it, but the Senate certainly was very much inspired by the leadership of the Senator from South Carolina with regard to the public housing program.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. The legislation to which the Senator from New York is referring was in connection with appropriations before the Committee on Appropriations, not in connection with a bill before the Committee on Banking and Currency, involving authorizations.

Mr. LEHMAN. Yes. In the voting record of Mr. Cole there is included his vote in the House on the bill itself, and also his vote on the appropriation, when there was a move to reduce, to commit, and to recommit the bill. I shall be very glad to read the voting record if there is any doubt in the mind of the Senator from Indiana. I did not wish to take up the time of the Senate to do so.

I wish to say further that in the hearings before the Committee on Banking and Currency, Mr. Cole made it crystal clear that his views remained unchanged and that his opposition was fundamental and just as strong as it was in 1949.

Of course, he indicated that, as head of the agency, he would seek to carry out the law. However, he also made it very clear, as the Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse] has pointed out, that his opposition was just as strong as it had been in 1949 and, while he would feel himself bound to carry out the provisions of the law, he would not change his sentiments at all. I maintain that no man can possibly have the sentiments that Mr. Cole has had for several years, and apparently still has—and I base that assertion on the testimony before the Committee on Banking and Currency—and handle this complex, important, and intricate question of housing in an objective manner. That, as I have said, is one of the reasons why I certainly feel it my duty to oppose confirmation of the nomination.

Mr. President, with the strong, forceful, and consistent record which Mr. Cole has made in opposition to public housing, can he or any other man having his convictions now say he is in favor of a program which he once said, "may become so strong as to strangle America."

In my opinion he never can and he never will. While I respect him for maintaining his position, I am very fearful that his long-held views and opposition now will lead to deemphasis and curtailment of the public housing program, if not its eventual liquidation.

Mr. President, because I believe that our public-housing program is still vitally needed, because it is essential to many large groups in my State, as well as in many other parts of the Nation, and because I believe the present nominee is barred from effective administration of the public-housing program by sincerely held beliefs and opinions, I must oppose confirmation of this nomination. I could not in good conscience do otherwise.

Mr. President, I ask that the yeas and nays be had on the question of the confirmation of the nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUSH in the chair). Is there a sufficient second?

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to take a few minutes to make known my opposition to confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Cole as Housing and Home Finance Administrator.

I believe the record has been made abundantly clear, by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], as to why confirmation of this nomination should be opposed.

Some time ago, when I was informed that the President was to nominate Mr. Cole to be Housing and Home Finance Administrator, I said it was "like putting a fox in charge of a chicken coop." Mr. President, in that parlance I have indicated that to put Mr. Cole in charge of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, in view of his record of firm opposition to the objectives and purposes of that Agency, would be to put in charge someone who would see that it is no longer an active agency and function of the Government.

I believe the record is crystal clear that Mr. Cole does not believe in public housing. I believe the record is equally clear that Mr. Cole has advocated the views of those throughout the United States who have been the opponents of Federal assistance for low-rent public housing and slum clearance. I further believe the record is crystal clear that Mr. Cole's nomination is being most vociferously and actively supported by the lending institutions, the private contractors, and the private building industry in the United States who, again, have a record of firm opposition to public housing.

I do not believe it is necessary at this time to debate the merits or demerits of the policy of the United States in reference to the housing program. The national policy is embodied in the Housing Act of 1949. It is a comprehensive, inclusive policy which represents such factors as the Federal Housing Administration, mortgage guaranties to private builders, technical research for the building industry, slum clearance, redevelopment programs, community redevelopment, public housing, and farm housing.

How did Mr. Cole, when he was a Member of the House of Representatives, vote on this measure? How did Mr. Cole, the present nominee, the potential, new Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, vote, when he was a Member of the House of Representatives, not just on the public housing aspects of the Housing Act, but on the total bill? I have before me the record, and I am informed by the weekly report of the Congressional Quarterly, for the week ending March 6, 1953, on page 297, as follows:

During consideration in 1949 of the first major postwar public housing and slum-clearance bill, Cole supported an amendment to delete the low-rent public housing provision; voted for recommitment of the bill, and against final passage.

Mr. President, that indicates to me that this gentleman, with all of his many fine attributes and assets—and I am not contesting his sincerity nor his integrity of purpose—is opposed to the basic housing policy of the Nation as adopted by the Congress in 1949.

If Congress wishes to open again the entire matter of that policy, then, indeed, we shall have an opportunity to reexamine the qualifications of Mr. Cole.

But today we have a housing policy and a housing program. The present nominee, whose nomination is before us this afternoon, has been unalterably opposed to every aspect of that program. He voted against final passage of the bill, despite the fact that he had an opportunity to place himself clearly on record when he voted on the public housing aspects of the bill, in a separate amendment submitted in 1949. Furthermore, not only did Mr. Cole take a negative position in 1949, but, as has been revealed by his voting record, which was submitted to us today by the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], in every instance, whenever there was an appropriation request for housing, Mr. Cole voted to reduce the amount of the appropriation; he voted, in fact, to emasculate the housing program by withholding the necessary funds.

In fact, again according to the Congressional Quarterly, in 1951 Mr. Cole not only voted to cut down the amount of the appropriation, but voted to take away the right of the Federal Government, in the 1951 Defense Housing Act, to acquire land in isolated areas for developments in connection with defense installations. So even when defense installations were involved, Mr. Cole said, "No"; he said there should be no Federal housing whatsoever even in defense areas where there was a definite need for such activity.

Mr. President, I should like to have the Senate consider this question: What is the housing policy of the new administration?

I ask the new administration whether its housing policy is the policy of the nominee whose nomination has been submitted to us. If it is, then I ask the new administration to have the courage to say that the housing policy, as we know it now, is done.

The only way we can ascertain what is the housing policy of the new admin-

istration is by means of the nominations that are submitted to us.

The present nominee has made his position perfectly clear, for he is an honorable man. However, I disagree with him on this issue.

The nominee has said he has an open mind; he has said he would make a study of the situation and of what should be done on the housing issue. However, I understand that there are other views on this matter. For example, I hold in my hand a copy of an Associated Press dispatch which relates to inquiries made of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT]. The inquiries were made on March 2, 1953, I believe. At that time the Senator from Ohio was quoted as follows:

TAFT said he had recommended to President Eisenhower that an administrator be chosen who had no record on housing issues but was satisfied that Cole would do a good job.

"I suggested to the President that he appoint someone with the understanding he would have 6 months to study the situation and recommend what should be done with the housing agency," TAFT said.

He noted that public housing, finance and loan divisions of the overall agency are self-operating. He said it might be well to transfer some of them under the wing of other departments, adding:

"I don't think we need a Home and Housing Administration at all," TAFT said.

Although TAFT indicated he doesn't believe Cole has been instructed to make such a survey as the Ohioan suggested, the Senator said Eisenhower has reserved to himself and Congress the decision on the future of the organization.

Mr. President, I submit this raises the entire issue as to what the situation is in the case of the Housing and Home Finance Agency. Shall it remain as an autonomous agency, an independent agency? Or shall its functions be incorporated in those of other departments or agencies of the Federal Government? What shall be the context of the program?

The program was brilliantly defended in the Senate by Senators on both sides of the aisle. One of the most brilliant defenders of the program, and one who gave the classic rationale in the case of housing, as we have it, was the Senator from Ohio. The entire housing program as it is now developed was an accepted part of the governmental machinery and program for the people of the United States.

Yet I see in this nomination the beginning of a change in the basic housing policy of the Congress and of the Nation, and I submit that in this instance that change is coming in the back door.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield to me?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. JACKSON. Is there in the record anything to indicate that Mr. Cole would request in good faith, at appropriate times, of the Bureau of the Budget sufficient funds to permit the carrying out of a public-housing program? I believe that question goes to the heart of the discussion here today.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from Washington for that question. It indeed goes to the heart of the matter. In fact, I was about to address myself

to that very problem. What are the prerogatives, what are the responsibilities, what are the duties, what are the privileges of an administrator of an agency? An unsympathetic administrator can see that an agency dies by lack of economic blood plasma to keep it alive. There are many ways to kill off legislation. It is unnecessary to repeal it. Sometimes it is merely allowed to wither away, and it just dies out. After all, the body politic needs some sustenance, too, and if a housing agency does not get the funds with which to carry on its program it does, and its program dies. The Senator from Washington is eminently correct in the question he asks, which has an automatic answer: Indeed, it is self-answering. The truth is that Mr. Cole has been unsympathetic toward the purposes of this act, and an administrator unsympathetic to the purposes of the act could readily, easily, and effectively choke off the whole program by simply not requesting from the Bureau of the Budget, from the President of the United States, from the committees of the Congress, the funds with which to carry it out. And, Mr. President, "by their fruits ye shall know them." Had the Housing Administration found it necessary to live on the crumbs that were to be dropped into its mouth for sustenance by ex-Representative Cole, it would be a victim of political malnutrition and economic emaciation.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. JACKSON. I served with Mr. Cole in the House of Representatives, and I have a very high regard for his honesty, integrity, and ability. But I am greatly concerned as to whether he would in good faith request funds with which to carry out the provisions of the law. I understand he has testified that he will live up to the law. Of course, he takes an oath to do that, but I submit to the Senator from Minnesota that that is not sufficient. I think the Senate has a right to know whether he will do so in good faith. It would occur to me that good faith would include a willingness on his part to request funds adequate to carry on a definite public-housing program.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I may reply to the Senator by quoting from page 20 of the testimony as reported by the Committee on Banking and Currency, on the nomination of Albert M. Cole. Beginning with the concluding sentence of a question by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], I read from page 20:

An unsympathetic administrator can always put roadblocks in the way of specific projects on the grounds that the site is not suitable or that this or that is not suitable.

Mr. COLE. I understand.

Senator DOUGLAS. And therefore, in effect, he can prevent the will of Congress from being carried out.

Mr. COLE. I would agree that it could be done that way.

Senator DOUGLAS. This is really the doubt that has concerned me ever since your name came up: Can an honest man—and you are an honest man—who is sincerely doubtful about or disbelieving in public housing, put aside his honest opposition when these administrative decisions come up?

Mr. COLE. I do not know. How could I know? All I know is what I think. If I say to you I am a sincere man, what does that mean?

Senator DOUGLAS. If you were not a sincere man, it might be easier for you because you might then bend to the storm and approve these projects, even though you did not believe in them. But being a sincere man, and not believing in these projects, can you really facilitate them? It is that which worries me.

Mr. COLE. I think so, but how can I tell you. I do not know. I think I can.

Mr. President, that is about as definite, I may say, as a woman's fancy about next year's fashions. There is simply no definiteness whatever to these answers.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. JACKSON. If Mr. Cole should fail to request funds for new projects, he would not have a housing program to believe in, would he?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. JACKSON. I believe he refers to his belief in the law, but I think there at least should be some affirmative statement in the record which would indicate that he is not only willing to carry out the law, but is also willing to act in good faith, and will request appropriate funds from the Bureau of the Budget from time to time as the need arises. I have been unable to find anything in the record which would indicate that he will do that.

I may say that I have supported all of the President's nominees to date. I should like to support this nomination. From the record thus far, I have a serious question in my mind as to whether the nominee can act in good faith and carry out not only the law but the spirit of the law as intended by the Congress of the United States when it was passed.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I will yield in a moment.

Mr. President, I have acted in the same spirit which the Senator from Washington has announced. As a member of the committees of this Congress, I have supported nominees of the President, many of the nominees holding personal political views with which I might disagree. But they have no congressional voting record. They have made statements, but I have found out in just a short experience in public life that statements are one thing, but the roll-call vote is another. One cannot vote "maybe" around here. He votes either yes or no. And I notice that Mr. Cole did not vote "maybe" either. As a Representative from the State of Kansas, his voting was perfectly clear and forthright. One does not have to have a Phi Beta Kappa key or a master's degree in public housing legislation in order to find out where this gentleman stands. He is opposed to it. I respect his position. I disagree with it, but I respect the integrity of his position. But, Mr. President, as I said a moment ago, this would be like putting a fox in charge of a chicken coop. The fox makes no secret as to what his desire is in regard to the chickens. Mr. Cole leaves no doubt at all as to what he believes about the housing program.

I am not influenced at all by the fact that he says he will obey the law. This is like asking a schoolboy, "Won't you attend school?" when there are compulsory attendance laws on the books. Of course, he will attend school; he must. When a man takes an oath of office, saying that he will uphold, support, and defend the Constitution, and the laws of the land—of course he will. But, Mr. President, there is a great deal of difference as to how it is done. It depends upon the vigilance of the administration. It depends upon the enthusiasm, the spirit of the administration. I am fearful that in this instance the flesh is not only weak, but that the spirit is weak also; and therefore I say it would be wrong to confirm this appointment. It would be wrong, if I am to believe what I was told and what the American people were told during the great campaign, that these great social programs were to go on. I say, Mr. President, that today the cities of America are sick—sick with slums, sick with tenements, sick with disease in their underprivileged areas.

I further say, Mr. President, that no program has ever been brought to the Congress that has a better alternative than the one we have for cleaning out the slums and relieving the grief and the suffering of those who live in the tenement and slum districts of American cities—all the talk about privately financed housing, all the talk about free-enterprise housing, still does not give the needy a decent place in which to live. Go over the cities of America and see what has been done in the matter of public housing. Go to the cities where there is no public housing, and see the degradation, the slums, the social cancer that grows in their midst. I do not intend to be a party to repudiating the public housing program by voting to confirm the nomination of someone who is going to see to it that it is not effective. Mr. Cole as an honorable citizen, cannot possibly make it effective, because his whole public life has been dedicated against its effectiveness. He does not believe in it. I respect his belief, but, Mr. President, that is the wrong type of man to have in charge of a program such as this.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wish to yield to the Senator from Kansas. I believe I should.

Mr. CARLSON. I think the Senator from Minnesota. I believe he made the statement that Mr. Cole was opposed to public housing.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. CARLSON. In that connection, I desire to cite page 20 of the hearings before the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency on the nomination of Mr. Cole. I read:

Senator DOUGLAS. That being so, I do not know what your conclusion is, but my conclusion is that you cannot take care of all of those people under private housing and that you need some public housing to help provide decently for the families and the kids who are ousted in the process of slum clearance.

Mr. COLE. I think it is possible that private enterprise might be able to do the job. It has never been tried. That is No. 1. No. 2

is, again, I am not opposed to public housing, as such, or shall I put it in another way: I am not opposed to the assistance of low-income people to obtain low-rental units. That assistance, if it should come through the Federal Government, that is fine. I would like to localize it as much as possible, however. I think too much of it has been centered in Washington.

Again, I am trying to say it is a question of how we would do it, rather than whether it be done.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from Kansas. But I suggest to him that he read the next page. On the next page there occurred the following colloquy between the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] and Mr. Cole:

Senator DOUGLAS. Generally, you want someone who is sympathetic with the purpose of a title, to administer that title. That is the point.

Mr. COLE. If I were completely unsympathetic with the need to help low-income people obtain low-rental units, yes. I am saying to you I am not. I am not only not unsympathetic, I am tremendously interested in securing that sort of thing. I am saying that very positively. That I can say, and that I can say in all sincerity.

Senator DOUGLAS. Are you sympathetic to having their needs met, in part at least, through public housing?

Mr. COLE. Through a form of public assistance, yes.

Senator DOUGLAS. And assistance so that they could pay their rents privately?

Mr. COLE. I do not mean to put them in welfare programs. I believe there is a way we can expand the program.

Senator DOUGLAS. Without public housing?

Mr. COLE. The term "public housing" I still do not like.

Senator DOUGLAS. Well, it happens to be in the act.

Mr. COLE. Well, maybe it is. I do not know.

Mr. President, let me say that this is not in the realm of theory. We are talking of reality. We have a law which was hotly debated in the 80th Congress, the 81st Congress, and other Congresses. We have had a Federal Housing Act since 1937. It is not new. The law is perfectly clear. It states exactly what the objectives of our Government are to be in the field of housing, both private and public. Mr. Cole is not in support of that law. We can give all the explanations we want to, and I know we try to do so, but sometimes we have to express our philosophy in one word, "Yes" or "No." The "Yes" and "No" votes of Mr. Cole are crystal clear.

In 1949 he supported an amendment to estimate the public-housing provision of the law.

Second, he supported an amendment to send the bill back to committee, which is a gentlemanly way of killing a bill.

Third, he voted against final passage.

Frequently someone votes against certain amendments to make his position perfectly clear, but when it comes to the final vote he has to vote for a housing program or no housing program. What did Mr. Cole do? He voted for no housing program. He cannot erase that from the record. Furthermore, Mr. President, I have not heard him repent for what I consider to be his mistake. From 1949 to 1952 former Representative Cole openly and vigorously opposed Federal assistance in the field of housing

or any low-rent, low-income housing. That is his record.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. In the case of Mr. Cole the record is very clear with regard to his point of view, with regard to his philosophy, and with regard to his policy in connection with the housing bill. His record is so clear that there can be no disagreement with reference to it. I placed in the RECORD, a little while ago, a memorandum showing the votes of Mr. Cole in connection with public housing. The Senator from Minnesota has emphasized that record. Mr. Cole voted five times to cut public housing down to a maximum of 5,000 units. That is merely a token number. It is a fraud on the public, as was stated on the floor of the Senate when the appropriation bill was being considered 2 years ago. It is a complete fraud. We cannot do anything with 5,000 public-housing units. Such a number is almost as valueless as no public housing whatsoever. Yet, Mr. President, that is the extent to which Mr. Cole was willing to go. He talked against a larger number of units. He voted against an appropriation bill provision which allowed a larger number of units when we in the Senate raised the number to 35,000 units. Even that number would be inadequate. Mr. Cole must know that there cannot possibly be slum clearance without public-housing units into which to place the people who have been taken away from the slum areas.

Mr. Cole also spoke on the floor of the House against the research features of the bill, and he was more than lukewarm against the farm housing features of the bill.

There is no reason in the world why we should have any confidence in a man who has taken this position for many years and still maintains it, as can readily be seen in the report of the hearings before the Banking and Currency Committee.

As the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] has pointed out, there has been no repentance on his part whatsoever. To place this man in such an important position would be analogous to appointing as Secretary of Defense a man who had declared himself to be hostile to air power and to the Air Forces, in spite of the fact that the Congress of the United States recognizes the importance of air power and the Air Forces.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I think the Senator's analogy is correct.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President—

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I commend the Senator from New York on using the term "slum clearance." In the days when Secretary Ickes had a branch in his office public housing was not then known as public housing, but as slum clearance. The reason for public housing was to clear slums in New York or Minneapolis or wherever they might exist. Slum clearance was the issue in 1933. Last year, in connection with the appropriations for independent offices the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] did not want public housing in Chicago unless it cleared the slums for poor people.

I am glad the Senator from New York brought up the question because, from my knowledge, the purpose of public housing is to clear the slums for persons who could not otherwise afford to get out of slum areas. The purpose was to put the people back near their jobs, near the point at which they worked.

Mr. LEHMAN. I thank the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, bad as the term "public housing" may sound to some persons, there is something that is much worse, namely, the filth, the decay, the degradation, the poverty, the social cancer of slums. I have been around the cities of America enough to know the kinds of conditions that exist in some of the older areas of our great metropolitan centers. I can see that city after city is suffering financially, politically, and socially, because there is a blight which sets in and spreads like a vicious circle to consume the city. The facts are crystal clear. We talk about public housing being expensive. Nothing is more expensive than slums. We talk about the hand of the Federal Government on the local community. Let me say that the hand of poverty and misery is much worse than is the hand of the Government of the people, for the people, and by the people.

I am not impressed with all these arguments. What I am impressed with is the need for an effective housing program on the part of our Government.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I do not know whether there has been discussed in connection with the very important nomination before the Senate another subject which is involved in it, but whether there has been or not, I think the Senator from Minnesota will agree with me that there has been a very serious trend in the past 45 or 50 days, on the part of many new administrative officers, to raise interest rates. I read the testimony of Mr. Cole, and although it is somewhat vague as to what he would do about the rate of interest for veterans' housing, which is 4.25 percent—

Mr. LEHMAN. No; it is 4 percent.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Four percent; I thank the Senator. It seems to me from a reading of Mr. Cole's testimony that he would offer no resistance whatsoever to any trend toward increasing interest rates on veterans' loans or FHA loans so they would be anywhere from 4 to 6 percent, the limit which the law provides.

That is a very serious matter to the average person who may be buying a small home. A 1-percent interest rate increase on a \$10,000 home would mean \$100 a year. A 2-percent raise would mean \$200 a year, or between \$17.50 and \$18 a month. If that is extended to a 20-year payment, it will be found, in some cases, that when the interest rate gets above 5 percent, the person who buys a small home will have paid in interest charges, at the end of the term, more than the amount of principal.

I read Mr. Cole's testimony. I wonder if the Senator from Minnesota will agree with me with respect to it. In answer to the chairman of the committee, Mr. Cole said he might wait for an inquiry on the

part of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, but he did not think he ought to wait more than 30 days.

A very rapid rise in interest rates is indicated, and I think the trend in that direction has been sufficiently shown.

I know Mr. Cole, and I agree with what Senators have said about his frankness, honesty, and integrity. But I am afraid that I shall have to oppose confirmation of his nomination, not so much because of his position in regard to slum clearance, as because of what I think is a very dangerous trend, so far as the average person in America is concerned, namely, the tendency to raise interest rates. I think such a trend would affect the little home buyer more than any other person in the United States.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I desire to thank the Senator from Washington.

Mr. Cole himself did not limit himself to 30 days. In all fairness, he said, in reference to the matter of interest rates, "Perhaps 30 days is a little bit short"—and possibly it is.

On page 23 of the testimony or report of the hearings, it will be found that Mr. Cole was very cautious with reference to the matter, and suggested that no precipitate action be taken.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I wish to make merely one statement, I shall vote for the confirmation of Mr. Cole's nomination. Unless I am wrong—and the Chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, who is present on the floor can correct me, if I am—I understood Mr. Cole to state that he would not be in a hurry to take action in the matter of interest rates.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is what I just stated.

Mr. MAYBANK. He said that he would report back to the committee before he did anything. If he intends to report back to the committee, I shall be there, together with the chairman of the committee, when he reports back about increased rates of interest.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I know that the Senator from South Carolina has always been opposed to raising interest rates on Federal housing.

Mr. MAYBANK. Of course I have. I will go further and pay my respects to the distinguished Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK] who, read into the RECORD this morning the interest rates the Government is paying on the debt. I think it would be a mistake to raise the interest rate on housing loans.

Mr. MAGNUSON. From reading the record of Mr. Cole's testimony with respect to increasing the rates of interest, it seems to me that if bankers could prevail upon the administration to have a general increase in Government interest rates as well as other interest rates, Mr. Cole, as Administrator of Federal Housing, would surely offer no opposition to a raise in interest rates on veterans' housing or FHA housing.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I shall let Mr. Cole's record speak for itself. It is a record of opposition to the Housing Act of 1949—a record of obstruction to housing appropriations.

Mr. MAYBANK. If the rate is raised for one type of housing, it will have to be raised for all. We cannot have one rate for agriculture, another for the Federal land bank, another for Federal housing, and so forth.

Mr. HUMPHREY. My reply to the Senator from Washington is that the record with respect to Mr. Cole speaks for itself. I think that in considering his nomination, it is not necessary to go into the realm of conjecture. It is only necessary to go into the realm of recorded legislative facts.

In the area of interest rates, Mr. Cole was cautious. He said he did not think he could have any answers before 30 days. Moreover, he said he would surely consult with the Committee on Banking and Currency.

However, I should like to point out that, as the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] has just suggested, once a start is made in adjusting interest rates, automatically there is set into effect a chain of events which may necessitate the raising of interest rates in other areas of our economy. This has already started. This is the policy of the new administration.

The President of the United States has sent to the Senate the nomination of Mr. Cole. I understand that the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, by a split vote, has concurred in that nomination. It is my intention to vote against the confirmation of the nomination, primarily because Mr. Cole does not represent, on the basis of his official record and in his statements in connection with matters of policy for which he has stood, the purposes and objectives of the Housing Act of 1949.

I have no personal comments to make about Mr. Cole as an individual. I only say his views are not similar to the housing policies of Congress, which were adopted by an overwhelming majority in 1949.

I think that Mr. Cole's nomination should be rejected.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, Mr. Cole is an outstanding citizen. Many persons who were Members of the House with him know his ability, his character, and his courage. I am quite certain they have sincere admiration for him, despite the fact that he may be against public housing.

Mr. Cole has been nominated to be Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, which is a kind of overriding organization. Originally the Home Loan Bank Board, the Federal Housing Administration, and the Public Housing Administration were separate and independent organizations, having different purposes. They were brought together on the theory that all housing agencies should be consolidated in one organization. Since that time a number of things have happened. It seems to me that the Housing and Home Finance Agency has built up much too large an overhead organization.

In the second place, the Home Loan Bank Board is a routine operation.

Third the Federal Housing Administration has relaxed its standards, until today it is not, in my opinion, at all serving the purposes which it was intended it should serve.

Of course, the matter of the administration of the public housing policy is in dispute, but there is also great criticism of the manner of administration of the Public Housing Administration. It seems to me that the man nominated to the position of Housing and Home Finance Administrator will have the task of going into the whole question of public housing, reporting to the President what should be done.

As I see it, the question, at least for the present is one of administration, including recommendations which may be made to the President and Congress, designed to improve the various organizations involved.

The Public Housing Administration and the Federal Housing Administration are practically autonomous organizations. The head of the Public Housing Administration is, and any person replacing him should be, a public housing man. Whoever may be appointed as head of the FHA probably will be someone from the general mortgage field.

I should perhaps have preferred as Administrator a man who had taken no position on this one controversy in the housing field, but it is very difficult to find such a person. As I understand, there were many candidates from the real-estate field and the building-and-loan field, who were essentially adverse to the whole idea of public housing. On the other hand, to put at the head of the Administration, which supervises the subordinate branches, a man who was an outstanding public housing advocate, certainly would also have been subject to some criticism.

Speaking for myself, as one who favors public housing, I would far rather have as Administrator one who has been a Member of Congress, who has approached the situation from a public standpoint, than one who is a real-estate man or a building-and-loan man, who would be essentially opposed to the whole program by reason of the nature of his business.

I believe that all of use learn to approach problems in a spirit of fairness. I myself talked with Mr. Cole before his nomination was sent to the Senate, and he assured me, as he assured the committee, that he proposes to administer the policy of the administration and the policy of Congress in accordance with the way those policies are developed and the way in which they are written into law.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. MAYBANK. I heartily agree with the distinguished Senator from Ohio. Mr. Cole is a former Member of Congress, one who knows the Congress. He says that he intends to carry out the laws which the Congress of the United States has enacted, and to administer them in keeping with the way they should be administered.

Mr. TAFT. My feeling is that we can count on Mr. Cole carrying out the policy of Congress. I think the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] very fairly stated that the administration must decide what policy is to be recommended. I certainly can assure the distinguished Senator that the appointment

of Mr. Cole is in no way a repudiation of the housing policy. How that policy may develop will certainly be determined in the future. For the present the only question involved is that of carrying out the present policy, the policy now written in the statute books of the United States by the Congress itself.

Mr. MAYBANK. I recall the days I served on the Banking and Currency Committee in 1941, 1942, and 1943. The distinguished Senator from Ohio did as much for public housing as did any other Member of the Senate.

Mr. TAFT. I thank the Senator.

I told Mr. Cole, "Possibly when you have made the complete study, you may have to recommend that your own job be abolished."

Many people feel that the financial end of the job, the FHA and the Home Loan Bank, ought to be in the Treasury, and that the Public Housing Administration ought to be in the Federal Security Administration or whatever other Government department may replace the Federal Security Administration. I myself do not know what I would say. The functions are somewhat different. The suggestion to which I have referred represents a possible approach. Mr. Cole might recommend the strengthening of this particular agency as an independent agency, which it is today.

In any event, I think Mr. Cole is well qualified. He has the highest character and possesses the best sort of record. I can certainly assure the Senate that Mr. Cole will follow the policy of the Congress, so far as there is involved, for example, the question of how many units we may build this year, before the final policy is determined. That particular policy will be determined at the highest level, and Mr. Cole will act in accord with that policy, whatever it may be, as fixed by the President's recommendations to the Congress and the action of the Congress in any law which it may enact.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The question was asked a while ago—and I think it was a very pertinent question—as to what Mr. Cole's attitude would be toward requesting funds for the number of units of public housing to be built during the next year. Do I correctly understand from the Senator from Ohio that it will not be Mr. Cole who will be requesting such funds, but that instead, the administration policy will set a certain level, and the request for funds will be contained in the President's budget? As I understand, the Senator from Ohio gives us assurance that Mr. Cole will go along with the program.

Mr. TAFT. Absolutely and completely so. I cannot say what Mr. Cole might argue one way or the other; but this is a matter of such tremendous importance that it will be determined by the President and his advisers—I am sure in cooperation with Mr. Cole—but the decision will be made upon a high level, and Mr. Cole says that he agrees wholeheartedly to go along with whatever may be determined to be the policy. Of course, the ultimate determination will

be made by Congress, no matter what the President may determine; but there will be an administration recommendation before Congress acts.

Mr. SPARKMAN. If the Senator will further yield, I should like to ask him 2 or 3 questions.

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I voted in the committee for the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Cole. I did so primarily upon the assurances which he gave to the committee that he would enforce the law. I know Mr. Cole personally. I served with him in the House of Representatives. I regard him as a man of character, integrity, and ability; and I believe that he will carry out the pledge he made to us.

I had seen in the press reference to a statement made by the distinguished Senator from Ohio, in line with what he stated here a few minutes ago, namely, to the effect that he had talked with Mr. Cole and had received certain assurances from him.

I believe the Senator from Ohio was quoted also as saying that the subject had been discussed either between him and the President or between the President and Mr. Cole, and that the same assurances had been given in that discussion.

Mr. TAFT. The question was discussed between the President and Mr. Cole.

Mr. SPARKMAN. And the same assurances were given?

Mr. TAFT. Yes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Let me ask the Senator from Ohio if the statement he has made with reference to the breaking down of the Housing and Home Finance Agency represents his clear-cut decision, or if he is merely suggesting that as a possibility?

Mr. TAFT. I think it is a question which ought to be studied. I voted for the Housing and Home Finance Agency on a previous occasion. I would have to change my views to reach the other conclusion. However, the question has been forcefully presented to me as something which should be considered, now that we are trying, in general, to get rid of independent agencies and assign them to the regular departments, so far as possible. For that reason this argument is more plausible than it was before.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Is it the Senator's understanding that that is one of the things which Mr. Cole is to study if his nomination as Administrator is confirmed?

Mr. TAFT. I think so. It is a question which should be determined in cooperation with the Treasury, the Federal Security Agency, and the President, before any recommendation is made to Congress.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Cole said he had been asked by the President to make a study of the entire program. I gather that he meant the program as it was being carried on.

Mr. TAFT. He meant the study of the agency from an administrative standpoint, to see how the administration could be improved.

Mr. SPARKMAN. As I recall, in his testimony before the committee Mr. Cole said the President had given him a double

directive. One directive, as I recall, was to study the entire program as it was actually being carried out. One reason I mention this at this particular time is that back in the closing days of the last Congress a subcommittee of the House Committee on Banking and Currency, under the chairmanship of Representative RAINS, from my State of Alabama, made a study of some of the housing problems, particularly as they related to veterans. By the way, Mr. Cole was a member of that subcommittee. He voiced considerable complaint with reference to certain practices by some of the builders and others engaged in the housing program. I wonder if Mr. Cole intends to carry out the recommendations for such a study which were made by the subcommittee of which he himself was a member.

Mr. TAFT. I did not discuss that question with Mr. Cole; I do not believe I can give the Senator any personal assurances. However, if I once study a matter in committee, certain thoughts remain in my mind, and I must pursue them further. I have no doubt Mr. Cole will do the same.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I asked him about that report in the course of the committee hearings, and he said he agreed with it.

I should like to make one further observation, if the Senator from Ohio will allow me to do so on his time.

Mr. TAFT. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. SPARKMAN. While I was not completely pleased with all of the responses which Mr. Cole gave to the committee, I did receive the very definite impression that he was trying to assure us that he would honestly administer the law as Congress enacted it, and that he would not, so to speak, throw any monkey wrenches into the law. My conclusion was that we might expect to see him carry it out.

Mr. TAFT. I am sure the Senator can count on such assurances.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I was very happy to hear Mr. Cole say that he was going to follow the directives from the administration and make certain investigations.

The Senator from Ohio knows of the tremendous impact of housing upon the economy of this Nation. We now have in guaranteed FHA and HHFA loans between \$10 billion and \$12 billion. Something must be done. I hope we may have a special agency for housing. As I told Mr. Cole when he was on the stand, it is the biggest thing in the country. The Army is building housing. The Navy is building housing. The Army engineers are building housing. The Guam Commission is building housing. Housing is being constructed in Alaska, and in many other places. There should be a concentration of effort. In my opinion, there should be a reorganization of the Housing and Home Finance Agency. Above all things, we could save more money by properly operating the housing agencies of the United States than we could save in any other field except that of national defense. I am glad to hear that Mr. Cole intends to look into the subject. I hope

he will do so. He will find plenty of places where consolidations may be effected, and where money may be saved.

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. Mr. President, I am glad this afternoon to speak briefly in favor of the nomination which the President has sent to the Senate, that of Albert M. Cole to be Housing and Home Finance Administrator. Mr. Cole is a former Representative in Congress from the First Congressional District of my State of Kansas.

Mr. President, I well realize that there is room for honest difference of opinion with reference to qualifications of men who are nominated for key positions in the Government. I am well aware of the fact that not only on the floor of the Senate but in the press on many occasions men are criticized for not being completely expansive and detailed in all their approaches to the problems which they must consider when they administer laws passed by Congress. I know that some Senators have criticized this nomination because they do not know in every particular where Albert Cole stands on all phases of public housing. That, however, is not all of his responsibilities.

Mr. President, from my acquaintance with Albert Cole I know he is not going to hide behind anyone, but that he will always be out in the open. He has told us frankly where he stands and the reason for his stand. While he was much more conservative than the senior Senator from Kansas in his feelings with respect to certain housing bills, I do know where Albert Cole stands. I can say to the Members of this body that Albert Cole is an honest, efficient, forthright man. He understands—and I am sure this is a virtue—that he must administer the laws as they are passed by Congress and that he must look to the legislative branch of the Government for direction as to the laws under which he operates. Congress legislates; he administers.

Albert Cole has stated unequivocally many times in his testimony before the Committee on Banking and Currency that if he were named Administrator of the agency he would support the position of Congress in administering the laws passed by it.

I need not elaborate, but we have on many occasions passed legislation and then questioned whether the legislation was being properly administered according to the intent of Congress. I stand here to testify in behalf of Albert Cole on many questions that may be raised, but on one particularly, and that is that from my acquaintanceship with him over many years, and as shown by his testimony before the Committee on Banking and Currency, I am convinced that he will faithfully administer the laws passed by Congress, and will carry out the directives of Congress.

As I said a moment ago, he may not have agreed always with the senior Senator from Kansas in some of his views, but that is an entirely different proposition from how he will administer the law once his nomination is confirmed by the Senate. He has stated candidly to the Committee on Banking and Currency that he will execute the laws passed by

Congress. He means that and he should be commended for that position.

Mr. President, I wish to go on record on at least two or three phases of this subject. I am glad that my colleague from Kansas made a correction of the Record a short time ago with respect to a statement made by the distinguished Senator from Minnesota.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] read only a portion of Mr. Cole's statement. I believe the complete answer of Mr. Cole is rather illuminating. It appears on page 4 of the hearings before the Committee on Banking and Currency. I refer to the point where the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] asked a question of Mr. Cole. A part of Mr. Cole's answer was quoted by the Senator from Oregon. I read the remainder of his answer:

There are times, of course, when the Government wants to do a job in housing as it does in many other segments of our national life and our economy, so I would say "Yes"—

He was referring to the Government's position in the public-housing field—

I would say "Yes," when conditions warrant it, there should be a gradual decrease of Government activity itself directed toward housing. Do not misunderstand me, sir. I think we have a tremendous possibility in this country to expand housing for the people of this country, and for all classes of people. For low-income people, for middle-income people, and for the other people.

I think we have barely touched the possibilities. As I envisage the housing program, it is one of advancement, one of progression. I hope, if I am Administrator, I can carry out that particular idea.

Mr. President, does that statement mean that Mr. Cole is opposed to public housing, or that he is opposed to the attitude expressed by Congress when it enacts specific provisions with respect to public housing? It does not. I say he is not against public housing as provided by the Congress. I know Mr. Cole well enough to say that when he stated to the Committee on Banking and Currency that he would carry out that law, that is exactly what he meant and is what he will do.

Mr. President, I have heard on the floor of the Senate criticism directed against men who had been nominated to fill Cabinet posts in the present administration because they would not elaborate on all phases of the question as to how they would administer their responsible positions. I say to my colleagues in the Senate that Albert Cole will administer the law according to the intent of Congress. To do so, might in some respects, be repugnant to what his ideas were when he was representing a congressional district in Kansas, but that is something else. At least he was candid enough to say what his position was at the time.

I appreciate the fact immensely that men who served with Albert Cole in the House of Representatives and who are now Members of this body have stated that he is an honest and forthright man and that they do not question his motives. Probably it is a little too much to assume, if his nomination should be confirmed, that he will carry out every detail in accordance with the views of

persons who feel otherwise, or who might feel that more public housing should be provided, but I can say to my colleagues that Albert Cole will do a good job, an honest job, and a forthright job, and that he will not circumvent the will of Congress.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hendrickson	McCarthy
Anderson	Hennings	McClellan
Barrett	Hickenlooper	Millikin
Beall	Hill	Monroney
Bennett	Hoey	Morse
Bush	Holland	Murray
Butler, Nebr.	Humphrey	Neely
Byrd	Hunt	Payne
Capehart	Ives	Potter
Carlson	Jackson	Purtell
Case	Jenner	Robertson
Chavez	Johnson, Colo.	Saltonstall
Clements	Johnson, Tex.	Schoeppel
Cooper	Johnston, S. C.	Smith, Maine
Cordon	Kefauver	Smith, N. J.
Dirksen	Kennedy	Smith, N. C.
Duff	Kerr	Sparkman
Dworshak	Knowland	Stennis
Ellender	Kuchel	Symington
Ferguson	Langer	Taft
Frear	Lehman	Thye
Fulbright	Long	Tobey
George	Magnuson	Watkins
Goldwater	Malone	Welker
Gore	Mansfield	Williams
Green	Martin	Young
Griswold	Maybank	
Hayden	McCarran	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Albert M. Cole, of Kansas, to be the Housing and Home Finance Administrator?

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I should like to take a few minutes of the time of the Senate to speak on this nomination.

First, I should like to say that today some Senators have touched upon only a very, very small portion of the duties of the position to which Mr. Cole has been nominated. I hold in my hand a list of only a portion of those duties, and I shall read from the list. The Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency is not only Administrator of Federal Housing, but he also has charge of the Public Housing Administration, the Home Loan Bank Board, the Federal Home Loan Bank System, the Federal National Mortgage Association, the prefabricated housing loan program, the community facilities program, the Alaskan housing program, the slum clearance and urban redevelopment program, the research program, the college housing loan program, the farm labor housing program, the defense housing and defense community program, the management of the housing program for World War veterans, the management of 42 PWA housing projects. I could go on and on in reading the list. I think there are approximately 40 agencies which come under the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield to me?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. BYRD. Does not the Senator from Indiana think that about half those agencies should be eliminated?

Mr. CAPEHART. In a moment I shall have something to say about that.

Mr. President, Mr. Cole, the nominee, after his nomination is confirmed, will administer, as did Mr. Foley, who preceded him, these many, many agencies I have not named all of them, by any means. Many of them no doubt should be coordinated or entirely eliminated at this time; no one knows exactly what is best to be done in that connection. However, someone should examine the situation. It is the intention of the President of the United States to do so, and to advise Congress of his recommendations.

So when Senators say that Mr. Cole was opposed to public housing, they are mentioning only one small portion of the duties of the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency.

Mr. Cole did vote against public housing; he himself admitted that he did. His record is clear. When he came before our committee, he did not hesitate to say that he had voted against public housing. He knew he had, and we knew he had, and he did not attempt to deny doing so.

I wish to call attention to the fact that one of our most able Senators, who is not on the floor at the moment, supported a certain candidate for President of the United States; but when the time came to vote, that Senator decided that he had changed his mind.

Perhaps Mr. Cole may decide to change his mind in respect to public housing; I do not know about that. In any event, there was no testimony before our committee to the effect that Mr. Cole was not able, that he was not honest, that he was not a good administrator, that he had not had experience.

The only adverse testimony was to the effect that, as a Representative, he had voted against public housing, as he had a perfect right to do if that was the way he felt about it. He frankly admitted his opposition. He told us before the committee that he would administer the laws on the statute books as written, and would follow the intent of Congress. He also told us something which I personally like very much; namely, that he would not spend the taxpayers' money on propagandizing either for or against public housing, but would devote himself to being a good administrator, and would not spend his time propagandizing against certain Senators or Representatives, or for or against any proposed legislation.

Mr. President, it is possible a better man might have been found, but we are called upon to vote on the nomination of at least an honest man and an experienced man, who has been appointed to a very important position and who will have administrative control not merely of the one agency which handles public housing, but of many agencies.

Now that all Senators who do not like Mr. Cole's record on public housing have been heard—and I can well understand their position—with the promise we have from Mr. Cole that he will administer the law, and that he is not now against public housing, let us confirm his nomi-

nation. He may have made a mistake, just as our able colleague in the Senate made a mistake, in my opinion, in advocating the candidacy of a certain man for President, and then, when the time came for supporting him, he had changed his mind. We all make mistakes. I cannot speak for Mr. Cole, but perhaps when he is placed in charge of public housing and slum clearance he may become a great enthusiast for those causes. I do not know about that; I cannot speak for him. I do feel that he will make a good administrator. There is at least one thing we do know, namely, where he stands. We are not buying a cat in a bag. As a result of what was said in the hearings and what has been said on the floor of the Senate today, I have an idea that Mr. Cole will make a better administrator because of the experience he has had in the past.

I ask each and every Senator to vote for the confirmation of Mr. Cole's nomination. The office to which Mr. Cole has been appointed is an important one, and I urge that we get 100 percent behind the nominee, because I honestly believe he will be called upon to fill the most important position in Washington. He will handle more money and will have more agencies under his control than any other officer of the Government. Furthermore, in my opinion, it is the toughest job in Washington, with the possible exception of that of President. It is a difficult position, and I do not know why anyone would seek to be appointed to it. Personally, I would not want the office, and I imagine that the President of the United States had difficulty in finding a man of experience who would accept the appointment.

So I appeal to Senators, now that we have listened to their objections, to get behind the nomination. All who have spoken have admitted that Mr. Cole is honest, that he is frank, that he would be a good administrator. So I urge my colleagues to eliminate the yea-and-nay vote and confirm the nomination unanimously.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Albert M. Cole, of Kansas, to be Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency? The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER] are necessarily absent. If present and voting, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] would each vote "yea."

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are absent on official business. If present and voting, the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] would each vote "yea."

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL] and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] are absent because of illness in their families.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] are absent on official business.

I announce further that on this vote the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] is paired with the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE]. If present and voting, the Senator from Illinois would vote "nay," and the Senator from Iowa would vote "yea."

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]. If present and voting, the Senator from West Virginia would vote "nay," and the Senator from Georgia would vote "yea."

If present and voting, the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 64, nays 18, as follows:

YEAS—64

Aiken	Griswold	McClellan
Barrett	Hayden	Millikin
Beall	Hendrickson	Monroney
Bennett	Hickenlooper	Payne
Bush	Hoey	Potter
Butler, Nebr.	Holland	Purtell
Byrd	Hunt	Robertson
Capehart	Ives	Saltonstall
Carlson	Jenner	Schoeppel
Case	Johnson, Tex.	Smith, Maine
Chavez	Johnston, S. C.	Smith, N. J.
Clements	Kefauver	Smith, N. C.
Cordon	Kerr	Sparkman
Dirksen	Knowland	Stennis
Duff	Kuchel	Taft
Dworschak	Langer	Thye
Ellender	Long	Watkins
Ferguson	Malone	Welker
Frear	Martin	Williams
George	Maybank	Young
Goldwater	McCarran	
Gore	McCarthy	

NAYS—18

Anderson	Humphrey	Mansfield
Cooper	Jackson	Morse
Fulbright	Johnson, Colo.	Murray
Green	Kennedy	Neely
Hennings	Lehman	Symington
Hill	Magnuson	Tobey

NOT VOTING—14

Bricker	Eastland	Pastore
Bridges	Flanders	Russell
Butler, Md.	Gillette	Smathers
Daniel	Kilgore	Wiley
Douglas	Mundt	

So the nomination was confirmed.

THE ARMY

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Clerk will state the next nomination on the calendar.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Lt. Gen. Lewis Andrew Pick O8096, Army of the United States (major general, U. S. Army, retired), for advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list under the provisions of subsection 504 (d) of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

AIR FORCE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Lt. Gen. Hubert Reilly Harmon, to be major general (Regular Air Force), United States Air Force, to be advanced on the retired list to the grade of lieutenant general and effective March 1,

1953, to be senior Air Force member, Military Staff Committee, United Nations, with the rank of lieutenant general and date of rank from January 19, 1948, under the provisions of section 504, Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Lt. Gen. Elwood Richard Quesada to be lieutenant general.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Lt. Gen. Idval Hubert Edwards to be lieutenant general.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Lt. Gen. William Ellsworth Kepner to be lieutenant general.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask that the President be notified of all nominations confirmed today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified of all nominations confirmed this day.

PROBLEM OF OVERLAPPING TAXES AND FUNCTIONS IN GOVERNMENT

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, as my colleagues know, I have been interested for a number of years in the difficult problem of overlapping taxes and functions among the three levels of Government—Federal, State and local. The latest of several bills I have offered in the Senate to set up a study Commission on Intergovernmental Relations was introduced on January 16, 1953, and is numbered S. 526.

There appears in the Washington Sunday Star of March 8, an article effectively describing the nature of the problem, its complexities and its future outlook. I ask unanimous consent that this article be included in the RECORD at this point in my remarks. I commend it to the attention of my colleagues as a worthwhile discourse on a long-standing, but outstanding, problem of Government.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FIXING TAX OVERLAP INEFFICIENCIES IS EASIER SAID THAN DONE (By Earl H. Voss)

Overlapping Federal, State, and local taxes have, over the past 40 years, caused many a frustration for the downtrodden American taxpayer, whose income and purchases sometimes are subject to assessment from 2, 3, or 4 governmental units. Every so often the area of overlap has to be pruned. That time has come around again and politicians on all levels of government are getting set for the assault.

Both the Republican administration and the Democrats on Capitol Hill are aware of the problem. It was studied at some length a year ago. President Eisenhower set up a White House conference recently to study the whole broad field of intergovernmental relationships.

The administration seems agreed that the first step in removing the undesirable overlap is a thorough study of the whole complicated picture. There already is a bill before Congress to set up a study commission. It has

been sponsored in the last several Congresses by Senator HENDRICKSON, Republican, of New Jersey. This year 10 other Senators have joined him as copponsors. Senator HENDRICKSON has been interested in the conflicting government functions and taxing authorities since he was in the State legislature in New Jersey. Another New Jersey official, Gov. Alfred E. Driscoll, has been a leader in the movement for better coordination between the various levels of government.

LITTLE OVERLAP UNTIL 1913

Up until 1913 there was comparatively little overlap in the American tax system. The Federal Government got all the revenue it needed from customs—which States were forbidden to levy—and from excises on liquor and tobacco, which the States had not yet begun to tap to any great extent. The States, counties, and cities got theirs from property taxes.

As government costs went up in the tense period before World War I, however, all levels of government started looking around for new revenue sources. By the 16th amendment to the Constitution, the Federal Government started taxing incomes. A very few States followed suit immediately, but most of them met their expenses by levying excise taxes on selected commodities.

It was not until the great depression that the States and cities found themselves hard-pressed for revenue. They tried general sales taxes, but still could not bring in enough money to meet their expanding expenses. The Federal Government finally stepped in to provide them direct assistance, in the form of loans or grants-in-aid for relief and work programs during the depression.

Just before World War II there was heavy pressure for doing away with conflicting taxation. But when the war broke out, State and local tax yields increased greatly. Lower levels of government could pay their own way again. The pressure eased until after the war. Meantime, the Federal Government was expanding the range of its taxes. And after the war, the overlap hurt States and cities that much harder.

The following table shows how Federal, State, and local tax-revenue sources overlapped in 1950 (in millions of dollars):

Tax	Federal	State	Local
Individual incomes.....	\$25,885	\$754	\$64
Corporation incomes.....	26,230	586	7
Sales.....	9,764	4,670	484
Property.....	0	311	7,065
Death and gift.....	760	171	4
Social insurance.....	4,900	1,028	3
Licenses, permits, others.....	145	1,450	383
Total.....	67,684	8,940	8,002

The sales-tax category in the above table applies to such things as gasoline, tobacco products, stamps, alcoholic beverages, gifts, admissions, and amusements.

States get most of their revenue from sales taxes, while local governments depend mainly on property taxes.

EIGHTY PERCENT TO UNITED STATES

The Federal Government got 80 percent of all the revenue collected in 1950; the States got 11 percent; and local governments, 9 percent.

The search for more revenue by all levels of Government tends to increase the areas of overlapping. In 1951 more than half of the 46 States whose legislatures were in session raised at least one major tax.

EXCLUSIVE AREAS?

Each time the issue of tax overlap has come up there have been some who want to move sharply in the opposite direction. They want to stake out exclusive areas for Federal, State, county, and city governments to levy taxes. This would simplify book-

keeping all around, but it wouldn't be very practical. Some economic areas are strong enough to stand the load of two or three governments' taxes. Other areas cannot produce enough revenue for even one. There just are not enough strong taxable areas to go around.

Separation of sources, as it is called, also would cause an unequal distribution of tax revenues in many areas. The present system tends to protect States with predominantly low-income taxpayers. It gives them services similar to those enjoyed by States with more high-income taxpayers. Separation of the sources of revenue might work hardships on the poorer States.

On the other hand, there are definite abuses in the overlapping-taxation technique. In Alabama, for instance, people are taxed four times on the same item: Federal, State, county, and city governments, all tax gasoline.

Besides being four times as vexatious as any single assessment, such tax overlaps have these disadvantages:

They tend to concentrate taxes unduly on a few economic areas, risking distortion in the national productive pattern.

They raise the cost of administering taxes by adding new corps of administrators to Government payrolls.

They harass taxpayers themselves and consume their time and effort filling out 2 or 3 tax forms on the same item.

They limit local governments' areas of taxation.

If separating tax sources is not the way to avoid the evils of tax overlapping, what is? The Treasury Department had some definite ideas last year.

DEMOCRATIC SUGGESTIONS

Here is a list of the methods the then Democratic Treasury Department outlined:

1. Tax sharing. In general, the Federal Government would collect certain taxes and share the take with States and their subdivisions. This is not possible in some cases. On cigarettes, for instance, State taxes vary from 1 to 8 cents a pack. The Federal Government would have to give all States the same percentage cut of the revenue. Those States which have high cigarette taxes would have to find replacement revenue if their total take were reduced.

2. Deductibility. One jurisdiction often allows deduction of other jurisdictions' taxes. For instance, Federal income taxpayers are allowed to deduct State income taxes from their taxable incomes. Some States allow similar deduction of Federal taxes. This becomes significant only in the higher income brackets.

3. Tax credits. Taxpayers would be allowed to claim taxes paid to States as a partial credit against Federal tax liability. This device has been used in transfer taxes at death, or in unemployment-insurance taxes.

4. Uniformity of tax bases and methods of computing taxes. States are now moving to make their definitions of taxable income coincide with Federal definitions. Some States peg their income taxes to Federal taxes, taking, for example, 10 percent of the Federal levy.

5. Administrative cooperation. All levels of Government exchange audit information, and cooperate in other areas of tax administration. The areas could be expanded, thus reducing the costs of administering the taxes.

SOME NOW IN USE

As will be noted from the above list, many of the methods of reducing the conflict among tax jurisdictions are already being used on a limited scale. These methods have come into use quietly, without fanfare or legislation.

The Treasury Department (then under Democratic leadership) thought last year that this kind of constant chipping away

at the most flagrant overlap abuses—without upsetting the infinitely complex tax system—was the way to handle the problem. Legislation, the Department seemed to think, might not be flexible enough to keep up with the changing economy.

The Republicans are expected to get around to studying the problem soon. They are committed in their platform and by their campaigns to take some of the pain out of taxes. But there is little likelihood that anything definite will be done to relieve tax overlap inefficiencies for a year or two. The issue is too complex.

PATIENCE IS POWER—ARTICLE BY GEN. OMAR N. BRADLEY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, America has been blessed by great leaders throughout its history. To my mind the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Gen. Omar N. Bradley, ranks in the forefront of those great men who in our hour of need and peril have given us wise and prudent guidance. His brilliant and heroic leadership during World War II is a glorious chapter in the history of this Nation. In these postwar years he has conducted himself in the same manner and spirit. He is indeed both a soldier and statesman.

In a recent issue of This Week magazine, the editorial page presented a guest article by General Bradley entitled "Patience Is Power." In these few short paragraphs this distinguished soldier-statesman has given to all Americans a philosophy and perspective needed in these trying times. Cutting through the technical, political, and military problems that beset the world, General Bradley has stated simply but profoundly a philosophy that should give us new hope and courage. It is a message of faith, patience, and strength. I commend it to my colleagues, and to the study and attention of free men everywhere.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"PATIENCE IS POWER"

(By Gen. Omar N. Bradley)

Before my father died, when I was very young, he used to say, "Be patient, son." I guess every father has said that to every son many times. It took me many years to understand it. I first learned what he meant when I tried to fish in a hurry. I found that it doesn't work. For a boy to catch a fish with an anglerworm, he has to carefully seek out and find the worms. Then he has to bait the hook and patiently wait for a fish to take the lure. He has to be calm and quiet. Most of all, to fish successfully, he has to keep trying.

An old friend of my father, trying to explain what he meant in later years, used to say that he didn't mean "sittin' patience," he meant "workin' patience." In other words, whatever your goal, don't sit and wait, but keep working at it. As a Nation, we Americans must learn that lesson.

The patience of free men has been sorely tried. Having done what we consider to be honorable and upright, both with our wartime allies and our present friends, we are hurt—and disillusioned—to find that peace is not ours.

By our own human standards, we have given generously. By our most Christian standards, we have acted as well as we knew

how. In our faith, we have believed that men are meant to be free. We have pledged every effort toward rebuilding a stable world, aiding both our friends and our former enemies. We have helped to reestablish our former enemies—Japan and Germany—in the ways of democracy. We have searched out the refugees to help them; and we have tried to get along with every race, every creed, every political belief. We have joined the United Nations, sponsored the Marshall plan, and even broken our tradition to join an alliance in peacetime for the defense of Europe—NATO.

We have given our resources, our energies, our ideals, and hopes to the cause of freedom. And yet peace is not abroad in the world. And our sons die on the battlefield again, this time in a far-off, remote corner of the world.

In our hearts, many of us can't help but repeat the anguished cry of Habakkuk, the prophet: "O Lord, how long shall I cry, and Thou wilt not hear? Even cry out unto Thee of violence and Thou wilt not save."

At such a moment, and in such a mood, we need more than ever before the steadying force of patience.

For the second time—this time with the new President—I have visited our soldiers, sailors, and airmen in Korea. They are anxious for an end to the fighting—they are pledged more deeply than any of us to a dedicated peace. But they do not want to quit, nor to appease the Communist transgression.

From them, we can learn the lesson: patience is a commodity as important as power. If we are patient our power won't be misapplied. Also, if we are powerful, we can always afford to be patient.

Patience, in itself, is not a policy. But patient steadfastness, in principle and in action, is an essential ingredient of good leadership.

If our determination for freedom is as great as the Communist desire for tyranny, we will always rally good men to our better cause. Communism as a political system has lasted less than 40 years.

This Nation, founded on the Christian ideal for every man, has lasted almost 200 years.

Christianity itself, with the help of faithful men, has lasted almost 2,000 years.

There is no chance of failure unless it be through haste. Resourceful patience on our part can help the world pluck security and peace out of the present nettlesome danger.

ADJOURNMENT TO WEDNESDAY

Mr. TAFT. I move that the Senate adjourn until Wednesday, March 11, at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 1 minute p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Wednesday, March 11, 1953, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 9, 1953:

IN THE NAVY

The following-named women officers of the Navy for permanent promotion to the grade of commander in the corps indicated, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

MEDICAL CORPS

Norma C. Furtos

SUPPLY CORPS

Dorothy M. Quinn.

The following-named officers of the Navy for permanent promotion to the grade of lieutenant (junior grade) in the line and

staff corps indicated, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

LINE

John Abbott	Edgar K. Lofton
James J. Ash	Preston Luke
Kenneth W. Atkinson	Frederick C. Marshall
Keith R. Bare	John E. Marshall
Albert T. Barr	Daniel N. Mealy
Robert E. Bennett	Robert E. Morgan
Joseph Brecka, Jr.	Charles P. Moore
Warran R. Brown	Fred S. Newman
Richard B. Campbell	Robert D. Norman
Charles C. Carter	William R. O'Connell
Thomas M. Castner	Louis C. Page, Jr.
William E. Clark	James H. Pressley, Jr.
James C. Clarke	Harold A. Riedl
Robert J. Duffy	George G. Russell
James R. Edixon	William G. Sizemore
Kenneth E. Enney	Gordon H. Smith
Jack E. Everling	Donald E. Sparks
Harry N. Farnsworth	Robert G. Stammerjohn
Robert W. Fero, Jr.	Charles A. L. Swanson
Arthur S. Fusco	Benjamin W. Taylor
William M. Golding	Harold L. Terry
Jerome E. Hamill	Harry E. Thomas
Martin H. Henry	Richard G. Thomson
Robert A. Holden	William E. Tillerson
John C. Humphrey	Ralph J. Touch
Roy T. Hynes	Marland W. Townsend
Robert N. Johnson	Dennis A. Tuck
Francis N. Jones	John H. Wachtel
Isaac F. Jones	Edwin S. Wallace, Jr.
Paul T. Karschnia	Albert J. Weil
Jack E. Keller	Henry T. White
Edward J. Klapka	George H. Willey
Edward V. Laney, Jr.	William O. Wirt
Robert L. Leydon	

NURSE CORPS

Irene N. Dowe	Mary V. Redfern
Dorothy S. Mathewson	Clarissa M. Shaw
Rose M. Miller	

The following-named line ensigns of the Navy for permanent appointment in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy:

Richard J. Biederman	Ward W. DeGroot III
Carl Courtright	Robert L. Jones
Walter E. Davis, Jr.	Warren G. Stevens

The following-named warrant officer of the Navy for permanent appointment to the grade of commissioned warrant officer as indicated, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

CHIEF CARPENTER

Naaman Dingness

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following-named officer of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of major general:

William O. Brice

The following-named officer of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of brigadier general:

William J. Scheyer

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for temporary appointment to the grade of major general:

Randolph McC. Pate	George F. Good, Jr.
Clayton C. Jerome	Merrill B. Twining
James A. Stuart	

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for temporary appointment to the grade of brigadier general:

Frank D. Weir	Ion M. Bethel
Alexander W. Kreiser	Nels H. Nelson
Jr.	David M. Shoup
Wilbur S. Brown	Francis B. Loomis, Jr.
John N. Hart	

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 9, 1953:

HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE ADMINISTRATION

Albert M. Cole, of Kansas, to be Housing and Home Finance Administrator.

IN THE ARMY

Lt. Gen. Lewis Andrew Pick, O8096, Army of the United States (major general, U. S. Army, retired), for advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list under the provisions of subsection 504 (d) of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

IN THE AIR FORCE

Lt. Gen. Hubert Reilly Harmon, 18A, major general (Regular Air Force), United States Air Force, to be advanced on the retired list to the grade of lieutenant general and effective March 1, 1953, to be senior Air Force member, Military Staff Committee, United Nations, with rank of lieutenant general and date of rank from January 19, 1948, under the provisions of section 504, Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

The following-named officers to be advanced on the retired list to the grade of lieutenant general under the provisions of subsection 504 (d) of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947:

To be Lieutenant generals

Lt. Gen. Elwood Richard Quesada, 50A.
Lt. Gen. Idwal Hubert Edwards, 11A.
Lt. Gen. William Ellsworth Kepner, 6A.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, MARCH 9, 1953

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty and ever-blessed God, who art always placing at our disposal the inexhaustible resources of Thy grace, may we daily appropriate our blessings with a greater sense of our absolute dependence upon Thee.

Grant that in all our plans and programs for the welfare of our beloved country and the world we may understand more clearly that we can never solve the many problems of humanity on a purely economic basis, for man does not live by bread alone.

We know very well that mankind needs food and clothing, but we penitently confess that we so frequently fail to heed the exhortation of our blessed Lord to seek first the kingdom of God and His righteousness.

May this be a day when we shall set ourselves anew to the glorious task of bringing to fulfillment the eternal truths of the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man.

Hear us in the name of the Christ, who is the way, the truth, and the life. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, March 5, 1953, was read and approved.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I take this time for the purpose of announcing that the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Armed Services will be glad to hear from any Member of the House on either Thursday or Friday of this week. The committee will

welcome the testimony of anyone who can be helpful in bringing about economy and efficiency in this field.

It is suggested that anyone desiring to appear before the committee advise the clerk of the committee so that a time may be fixed. The clerk is Mr. Orescan, branch 288 of the Capitol.

UNJUST CRITICISM OF CONGRESSIONAL INVESTIGATIONS

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, I see by the weekend papers that the critics of Messrs. McCARTHY, JENNER, and VELDE are as active as ever. I specifically refer to Mr. Elmer Davis, wartime head of the Office of War Information here in Washington.

It is obviously a waste of time, as well as being unnecessary, to attempt to answer every leftwing columnist and speaker who attacks congressional methods of investigation and chairmen of such committees. But I think it is proper to make a distinction between a vociferous group of gentlemen of the cloth who, given the benefit of the doubt, may be sincere in their motives but are completely misguided as to their facts. I say it is proper here to make a distinction between such individuals on the one hand and a gentleman such as Mr. Davis on the other. Criticism of congressional investigators of communism may be justified by some, but it comes with singular bad grace on the part of Mr. Davis who was head of a wartime organization notorious for the large numbers of pinks, dupes, and fellow travelers among its personnel. The OWI consistently adopted a pro-Soviet attitude throughout Mr. Davis' incumbency and, unfortunately, when it was absorbed by the State Department, a large part of its un-American element went along with it—into the Voice of America and other international information agencies. Mr. Davis, therefore, should probably be the last person in the world to open his mouth in protest against the methods of congressional committees investigating Communist activities. Can it be he fears possible revelations by such groups?

OHIO'S SESQUICENTENNIAL

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, this year the State of Ohio is observing its sesquicentennial. Although Congress has not yet formally admitted the Buckeye State into the Union, we are acting as if we are full-fledged members of the Nation.

I have been swamped with letters asking that our Federal taxes be refunded on the ground that we are not properly included among the States, and if anything can be done along this line, I could probably be elected president of the first republic of Ohio. Nevertheless, we are anxiously knocking at the door, hoping that Ohio will beat Hawaii into the Union.

SOVIET PREMIER MALENKOV

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, there is news this morning.

Under a Moscow dateline today there is the following report:

Soviet Premier Georgi M. Malenkov, speaking at the funeral of Josef Stalin, said his new government's policy was peaceful coexistence for capitalism and socialism.

"In the sphere of foreign policy, our main care consists of not permitting a new war and in living in peace with all countries," Malenkov said in his first statement on foreign and domestic policy.

Mr. Speaker, the free world should take Malenkov at his word. Here is an opportunity to make him fish or cut bait. Let us find out if he means what he says.

President Eisenhower should immediately accept this challenge and offer to meet Malenkov and other representatives of the great powers.

There is no time to lose. If the Soviet is sincere, the doorway to peace may be open.

Let us find out.

INDIVIDUAL INCOME TAX REDUCTION

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the repudiation of a preelection promise made either by a political party or by an individual to obtain public office creates a moral responsibility. The refusal of party candidates once they are elected on a promise made to get elected whether it be a promise to reduce taxes or other relief is a moral obligation to be faithfully discharged.

The great majority of the Members of the House of Representatives who were elected last November promised that if elected they would reduce taxes.

In compliance with that promise I introduced H. R. 1 to provide an 11 percent tax relief by moving up the termination date of the individual income taxes increased for the years 1951, 1952, and 1953. Unless H. R. 1 is enacted into law these increases will not expire until December 31, 1953. H. R. 1 provides that these increases will expire on June 30, 1953. The enactment of H. R. 1 is essen-